

LEVEL
ONE

Christian Order



Summary of Contents for December, 1981

KILLING THE KIDS	<i>Evelyn Elledge Risdon</i>
THE POPE'S MEN	<i>Philip Trower</i>
THE HEART OF THE GOSPEL	<i>Cardinal Arns</i>
ROUGH SUMMER	<i>The Editor</i>
DESTROYING BELIEF	<i>Msgr. Nelson Logal</i>
SILENCE, WORSHIP AND THE MASS	<i>Henry Edwards</i>

Just about everything depends these next few months on your willingness, dear readers, to renew your subscriptions by return of post if possible and to renew them as generously as you can. I know you will help me in this way and I thank you in advance for doing so.

Christmas Blessings on you all.

—*Paul Crane, S.J.*

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page	
578	THE YEAR AHEAD <i>The Editor</i>
580	KILLING THE KIDS <i>Evelyn Elledge Risdon</i>
585	ROUGH SUMMER <i>The Editor</i>
596	NO GENERATION GAP <i>W. M. Quirk</i>
601	THE POPE'S MEN <i>Philip Trower</i>
621	DESTROYING BELIEF <i>Msgr. Nelson Logal</i>
625	SILENCE, WORSHIP AND THE MASS <i>Henry Edwards</i>
634	THE HEART OF THE GOSPEL <i>Cardinal Arns</i>
638	BOOK REVIEWS <i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £3 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$5.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:

U.S.A., Canada

India, etc.—£6, U.S. \$15

Australia—£7, A. \$15

N. Zealand—£7, N.Z. \$15

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 22

DECEMBER

NUMBER 12

The Year Ahead

THE EDITOR

THE year ahead could well be a tough one. Just why this is so is best explained by giving you here the substance of a letter, which is going out to all those whose subscriptions fall due during the next four months. This is what I wrote :

December, January, February and March are "crisis months" where *Christian Order* is concerned. The reason is simply that the bulk of subscriptions to *Christian Order* fall due during these months. It follows that any slump in renewals during this time could bring disaster, an inability to meet current costs that would send us into bankruptcy. In the light of this fact, I ask you once again, this year, to be so kind as to keep in mind what I have just written and to help me once again, as you have done so marvellously in the past, by renewing your subscription without delay and, if possible, by return of post.

To renew, *please return this letter* to me with your subscription of £3 or \$5 enclosed, or the equivalent in any currency. Nothing need be written. Notes in any currency are entirely acceptable.

Last year, I had most reluctantly to raise subscription rates to meet rising costs. Your response was magnificent. I can never thank you sufficiently for it. As a result, *Christian Order* has survived, though by no great margin.

There is no question of subscription rates being raised this year. I am relying on two things to cover a 10% rise in printing costs and yet another increase in postage, both of which are due in January. The first thing I rely on is the promptness of your renewals. The second is the generosity which caused so many of you to send something extra, along with the higher subscription I was forced to ask for. This saved me. I ask all who can to do so again. This way we shall come through.

This is what I wrote. I add the following lines for this editorial.

A subscription for a friend or for a reader of the Editor's choosing (very helpful, this) is a way in which the circulation of *Christian Order* (now very healthy at approximately 10,500) can continue to be extended. You will find a form for a subscription for a friend enclosed with this number of the magazine. Please be so kind as to use it. This would be a great help.

Finally, I would like to apologise on behalf of *Christian Order*'s small, devoted and uncommonly hard-working staff for any delays or inconveniences of one sort or another we have caused you. I would like, once again, to ask all you good people whose subscriptions are due in December to be so very good as to renew them right away—*now*. This would give us here an enormous fillip and save us going into Christmas exhausted! We have to get in approximately 800 subscriptions in December. We need to have them all in *before Christmas Day*, if we are to have a good financial base for the publication of *Christian Order* during 1982. And would the few, the very few, who have not yet renewed their subscriptions, due in October and November, please be so kind as to send them in? Thank you all so very much.

At the end of this list of requests for which I apologise, but which I have to make in the interests of continued solvency, may I wish you all, wherever you are and with all my heart, a most joyful Christmas and every possible blessing during this coming year. Thank you again so very much for your great kindness and continued generosity to myself and *Christian Order*, which I know you value so highly.

Evelyn Elledge Risdon is a political scientist who has done extensive graduate work in Political Theory and Constitutional Law at the California State University, Los Angeles, U.S.A. An active member of the First Baptist Church of Los Angeles, she is a convinced and concerned pro-life advocate. *Abortion on Demand*, her book on which this article is based, is obtainable post-free at \$2.95 from the Reality Publishing Co., P.O. Box 67246, Los Angeles, California 90067. Acknowledgements to *Heartbeat*, Vol. 3, No. 3 for the republication of her article in *Christian Order*. We have taken the liberty of changing the title.

Killing the Kids

(The Rockefellers and Abortion on Demand in America)

EVELYN ELLEDGE RISDON

THE Rockefeller brothers, John D. III, Nelson and David, together with several other extremely wealthy men who had interlocking ties, influenced the United States Supreme Court to approve abortion, essentially on demand. How could this travesty of the judicial process occur ?

It began with the efforts of this group to influence the United States Government to limit population growth through the dissemination of contraceptives both at home and abroad. Ultimately this group began to see abortion as just another means of population control. But why should this group of extremely wealthy bankers, industrialists and publishers desire to curtail population growth and how did they succeed in influencing the United States Government and particularly the Supreme Court ? They succeeded through what has been called the "dictatorship of money". And the basic reason for their efforts was the desire for greater wealth.

Small Families and Profits

Economists in the 1950's and 1960's began to believe that smaller families with both mother and father working would increase banking and corporate wealth. The economist, Stephen Enke, for example, wrote that increased savings and investments were more profitable than a growing population. He showed that the ratio of those too young and too old to work as compared to those of working age was the important factor in the rate of savings. A higher rate of savings is very important to banks and other loan institutions, since it is the savings of the public which are loaned out by banking institutions and on which they derive their profits by charging a higher interest than they pay out. The Rockefellers and some of the other population-control activists control some of the largest banks in the United States.

Persons who have no children or few children will not only be able to save more money but they will have more money to spend on cars, on insurance, on air flights and on gasoline. These are all commodities sold and produced by the Rockefellers and some of the other population-control activists. Some of the corporations controlled by this group are Ford Motor Co., General Motors, Exxon Oil, Pan American Airways, Trans World Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Metropolitan Insurance, New York Life Insurance, Travelers Insurance, American Broadcasting Co., Goodyear Tyre Co., and others. A Congressional investigation in 1978 showed that 81 corporations were controlled by the Rockefellers.

The banks which are controlled by the Rockefellers and some of the other population-control activists have built a tremendous credit - card business, charging 18 per cent. interest. These credit cards promote impulse buying of luxury items. By discouraging people from having children through population-explosion scare tactics and by promoting abortion on demand, their credit-card customers have undoubtedly charged more (to their accounts) and paid out far more interest than they would have done, if they had had more children. This type of buying has also led to inflation, since the demand was there without having to wait until the money was in hand.

There is another side to this same coin of profit. The Rockefellers and their associates also saw population control and abortion as a means of reducing their taxes. Working couples without children or with only one child pay more taxes than families with several children : thus a middle class with a declining birth rate would carry a larger share of the tax burden.

The Rockefellers and their associates also looked at welfare costs and believed that these could be reduced with population control and abortion on demand. This is one of the arguments that the National Planned Parenthood Federation always uses in their brochures. It is an effort to bring the middle class into their own mercenary camp. What they are really saying, of course, is help us destroy lives and we will save you money through lower taxes. They will, however, take this money away through higher prices made possible by the high consumer demand of working couples with few or no children.

Rockefeller Influence and the Supreme Court

But how were the Rockefellers and their wealthy associates able to influence the Federal Government to help curtail population growth and to approve abortion ? They were able to do this through their interlocking ties with high-level appointed officials. This is our Federal Government. These interlocking ties are private social clubs, friendships formed in exclusive prep. schools and ivy league universities, business associations and organizations such as David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Brookings Institute, which are controlled by the Rockefellers and their wealthy associates and from which cabinet-level appointments are made on a regular basis. For example, all the Secretaries of State in the Eisenhower Administration worked for the Rockefellers before becoming Secretary of State. Also, most of Jimmy Carter's Cabinet, including Carter himself, were in David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission before Carter was elected President.

Six of the seven Supreme Court Justices who legalized abortion on demand have interlocking ties with the Rockefellers or with the other Rockefeller associates who pro-

moted population control. This would be irrelevant if these Supreme Court Justices followed the bias of the Constitution. However, the two dissenting Justices in their joint dissent state :

"I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the Court's judgment. The Court simply fashions and announces a new Constitutional right for pregnant mothers and, with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing State abortion statutes".

It is apparent that the Justices who declared abortion legal in 1973 were not following the bias of the Constitution but went beyond their authority. Above and beyond their friendships and associations with the Rockefellers or the other wealthy population-control activists, were there other influences on the Supreme Court which were promoted by this group of bankers, industrialists and publishers ? The answer is, yes. Because of the limitations of space in this article, I have been unable to provide you with specific detailed information. This is done in my book, which has the same title as the article. However I shall summarize briefly what the Rockefellers and their wealthy associates did to influence the Supreme Court, the White House and the general public to accept and legalize abortion on demand.

The White House Commission

John D. Rockefeller III founded the Population Council in 1952. Millions of dollars were poured into this organization from the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations for the purpose of influencing government policy. By funding population studies in several universities, this organization has been able to create a scientific community, beholden to the Rockefellers, that has been able to influence Congress, the executive branch of our Government and the Supreme Court.

In 1970, John D. III was chosen as Chairman of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. This was a White House Commission and the legislation which promoted this Commission was drafted

by Daniel C. Moynihan, who was a White House aide at the time. He is now a Senator from New York, the Rockefeller domain. Moynihan belongs to the Century Association, which is a private club to which Nelson Rockefeller and John D. Rockefeller III also belonged. Moynihan also belongs to the Harvard Club of New York City, as does David Rockefeller. This White House Commission was stacked with persons who believed in abortion on demand prior to being chosen. Many of these persons worked for the Rockefellers or received funds from the Rockefellers for population studies. I have documented in my book that at least 18 of the 25 persons on the Commission favoured abortion prior to sitting on it. It was this Commission which put the White House stamp of approval on abortion on demand. This must have influenced the Supreme Court judgment.

Nelson Rockefeller, as Governor of New York, held hearings on abortion and pushed through legislation in that State which legalized abortion. New York was the first State to do this. When the Legislature repealed the legislation on abortion, Nelson Rockefeller vetoed this act. David Rockefeller held a press conference in which he put the stamp of approval on abortion.

The National Planned Parenthood Association

The other population activists who have interlocking ties with the Rockefellers took over the National Planned Parenthood Association, which had been largely impotent until this group took it over and promoted its activities. This group also started the Population Crisis Committee and started as well an advertising campaign in the 1960's that was full of scare tactics regarding the so-called population explosion. None of their predictions were valid. They did influence the public, however, and many persons were led to believe that abortion was necessary for our survival.

In 1972 the Rockefeller Foundation gave \$50,000 to the James Madison Constitutional Law Institute. In that same year, this Institute handled the appeal for abortion in *Roe versus Wade*. In the companion case, *Doe versus Bolton*, this same Institute filed the principal pro-abortion brief. These cases gave us abortion on demand.

Reflecting on the riots that made last summer a rough one, Father Paul Crane sees as the centre of the trouble—the eye of the cyclone as it were—a society where the protection of property takes priority over the eradication of poverty. Out of the deprivation consequent on this inversion comes the violence that sparked the riots in Bristol, earlier on; then, last summer, in Brixton and Toxteth.

CURRENT COMMENT

Rough Summer

(Reflections on the July Riots)

THE EDITOR

A SOMEWHAT grim title; but I think it fits. In the immediate aftermath of the July violence in England's inner cities I feel impelled somehow to set down my reflections, even though printing arrangements over the summer forbid the publication of what I write here until December.

Looking in from Outside

Reflections are all they can be, for I know no more than anyone else about those disturbances; far less, I imagine, than a good many who are better informed than I am as to the details of those troubled days. The only merit I can claim, perhaps, is the possession of a principle or two in my head. These, along with the fact that I was in no way in the thick of things last July when violence boiled over onto the streets, give me possibly the kind of useful advantage that attends the impressions of the outside observer. Not that I shall offer any instant solution. I have not got any. All I dare hope is that, looking in from outside as it were and with a principle or two to guide me, I may be able to see the wood for the trees; viewing the trouble, that is, as a whole and in its setting. Particularly necessary is a good hard look at the long-term factors contributing to the unrest

that led to the rioting and their build-up over the years. I hope, when they come to the end of these reflections, readers will conclude that others besides the kids who turned themselves loose on the streets last July, should get a good deal more meted out to them than the kind of short, sharp shock, which Magistrates Courts in our major cities were dishing out to the young rioters within forty-eight hours of the end of the riots.

Young Men Without Hope

Which brings me to my first point; the reflection that hit me hard between the eyes whilst the riots were going on and that hits me harder, even now, in retrospect. Simply this; that the kids being arrested for depriving others of their property—bashing it in, busting it up, setting it on fire, looting it—were themselves from families deprived of one of the most basic rights to which any human being can lay claim, quite irrespective of his colour or condition. This is the right of access through work to the minimum means of a livelihood compatible with his dignity. This right is basic, inherent in man's nature, completely colour-blind. Its recognition is called for by social justice, about which so many talk so much; and so few know anything at all. Whatever may have motivated the copy-cat mobs (and consumerism has a lot to answer for here), one thing is certain, so far as I can see. Those which erupted in Brixton and Toxteth came out of the guts of the deprivation that the ugly face of contemporary British Capitalism has brought to the unemployed; not overnight, not at the hands of one particular political Party alone; but steadily, over the years, since the end of the last war. Young men without hope, with no means of work and so of a livelihood. This has been denied a sizeable segment of them since World War II. Over the years, since then, the segment has grown. And, as it appears, successive British Governments and Local Authorities have been content that things should stay this way; that the young unemployed, their lives set within the rot of decayed inner cities, should remain deprived of the work that would bring them dignity and, with dignity, hope. The deprived felt unwanted in a world that took no count of their deprivation. They were right to do so, for

they were unwanted. They felt abandoned, seeing no way out. Without hope.

Property and Poverty

By contrast, just so soon as the Have-nots erupted in Brixton and attacked the property of the Haves, all Hell was let loose; the whole force of the law crashed down on them. I asked myself at the time and I still ask myself, Why? Had the energy and speed that went to suppress the riots been set at the service of those deprived, not of their property, but of their basic dignity as human beings, there would have been no riots. But this was not to be. In the event, our world remains one in which property takes priority over poverty: this is the present reality. It represents a gross inversion, and the law appears as set to its service. Why should this be so? Because the men of property hold power in the land, as they have done for years. Therefore the law of the land protects the property of the Haves against the Have-nots, whilst doing nothing to further the claims of the Have-nots against the Haves. Commutative Justice is its field, not Social. For this latter you have to go to the moral theology of the Catholic Church; man's claim as a human being to the opportunity of gaining a livelihood, which the law should serve in positive fashion and does not. This is the deficiency revealed to me in startling fashion by last Summer's trouble. There is a law in this country, but there is a diminished moral sense: the secularization of contemporary society has seen to this. Under such circumstances, law appears as an instrument of oppression, a bludgeon in the hands of Authority to keep the deprived down. This is how the young Blacks—and a good many young Whites—see the law and its officers. Do you blame them? I don't. This, they know, is how it is.

Why Violence?

But why use violence? Why not? What other means are open to the deprived? When all other means of securing justice—which means in this context a job as a means to a livelihood—have been tried and have failed, what else are they to do? What hope is there these days for the young

unemployed, whether they be black or white, in the dead hearts of decayed inner cities? But there are long-term plans. I know. But I remember the words of Lord Keynes: "In the long run", he said, "We are all dead". Men have their lives to lead in the short; and when they are deprived of the means of living those lives of theirs, it is unlikely that they will be cheered up with the prospect of long-term benefits a long way ahead. Communists are not the only ones who conjugate their verbs in the future. Most politicians fall victim to this disreputable habit. Neither is the pill sweetened when the call for sacrifice is made by those who are obviously comfortably off and in tones so often of considerable asperity; as if the deprived, not those in control of the system under which they suffer, are responsible for their poverty. In some cases, of course, they undoubtedly are, but generalizations occur too often in this matter and do little good. Those responsible for them speak so often with all the emphasis of those who have half the truth. Which, of course, is the case. This is precisely what they do have; this and nothing more. Unemployment in a supposedly free society (for the unemployed poor are not free in it) is too complex a problem to allow for easy generalization of the sort indulged in by trade union leaders at one end of the pole and golfing suburbia at the other. All these do in their untutored ignorance is to polarize the situation still further, and who is helped by that?

Rake's Progress

Only a few sides of this central problem can be considered in this essay. Unfortunately, the compass allowed to each has to be short. Please note, by way of introduction, that there is no unemployment on Dartmoor. The problem, then, is not that of solving unemployment, but of solving it in a fashion that is compatible with man's dignity as a free and responsible human being. I wonder sometimes whether Mr. Tony Benn understands this. No one wants a Siberia in this country. Implied in this need to solve unemployment in a fashion compatible with freedom (which the poor do *not* enjoy in the concrete jungle of contemporary capitalism or at the hands of those in South America, for

example, who rule what is called the National Security State) is the further need of enduring co-operative effort, with this end in view, from all sides of the community and from within its every social range. The objective is to place the opportunity of work within the reach of all, especially the poorest. At the same time, it has to be remembered that too high a price can be paid for the preservation of this opportunity; too high in this sense that the mounting cost of such an operation can bring bankruptcy and, with it, social catastrophe of the type that doles out misery to all. The man on the horse is then brought in "to put things right". Inflation can end so easily in totalitarianism. It spawned Hitler in pre-war Germany. That should be enough to make us think. This is what Michael Foot and his friends affect not to see. Their memories are too short. It is time they stopped gazing at a fake future through rose-coloured spectacles. What they need more than anything else is to put on their reading-glasses and take a good hard look at the past. This done, they can begin to think realistically about the future in the light of reality. Only in that way. The rest is induced hallucination. Nonsense.

Jobs at any price—which means men being paid for less than they produce—means cumulative currency depreciation; the printing press as a government's way of economic life, with overmanning everywhere—disguised unemployment, as it is rightly called. Meanwhile, the value of a country's currency slides and, with it, the quality of its goods. In the end, nobody wants them; nobody really gains except the union pressure groups, which means the higher-paid ranges of organized labour (the lower ranges are discriminated against every time the claim for higher wages takes the form of a percentage increase). But for how long? The basic £100 a week of Joe Gormley's miners nowadays was worth £20 in 1964. Meanwhile, you get what I call the see-saw. Management and Labour both play it. Each year Management is bashed by the Unions for higher wages, irrespective of productivity. Each year Management gives way. Why not? Why worry? Wage increases are passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices. Wages rise, prices rise, profits rise—all on paper. The whole thing, really, is a fake and can only end in the crash of

national bankruptcy with, as a not unlikely consequence, the Hell of a completely closed totalitarian order. The Man on the Horse comes riding in, breathing national salvation, puts the whole population on the barracks square and rations their food and their lives. This is what Hitler did in Germany. Let us never forget it.

Underlying the whole of this Rake's Progress is the erosion of incentive, initiative and, above all, integrity; any real sense of responsibility goes where Workers and Management are concerned. Offer any man the opportunity of something for nothing and he will take it. This is certainly what Unions and Management have been in a fair way to doing since the last war. They have little to be proud of. No more have governments, of whatever colour. Until a couple of years and six months back, the printing press was the main instrument of; in fact, *was* government economic policy under Conservative and Labour alike.

No Apologia for Mrs. Thatcher

I hope this does not sound like an apology for Mrs. Thatcher. It is not meant to be. But I can understand what she is trying to do. She is trying desperately to cut down on the money supply, with a view to cutting down on the inflation. In itself, this is not merely reasonable, but necessary. The trouble is that Mrs. Thatcher is trying to do it without taking true count of its social effects. She is doing this because I do not think she really knows how the other half lives. Neither she nor her Government appear to have much of a clue in this regard. Unbeknown, in all probability, to herself she is re-creating Disraeli's Two Nations. The social price she is paying for the prosecution of her economic policy is both unnecessary and far too high. The workers and the poor, particularly the black poor, are bearing the brunt of it through the deprivation that unemployment brings. The intensity of that deprivation, thrust on those at the bottom, is not understood at the top. Their assent to it is notional, not real. They have not seen it, still less felt it. They do not understand. I do not know whether they want to understand. Too many are content to see the very poor as meant for no more than to be tidied up, swept under the carpet and out of the lives of those who

like to think of themselves as their "bettters", to use a horrible phrase. The top half of British society is coming through this time of economic hardship relatively unscathed; cutting down, yes, but what is this compared with the life of a young black worker in one room, with a wife and three kids, recently made redundant and, so far as he can see, lying in front of him no more than a lifetime of unemployment in a depressed inner city. Meanwhile, the TV, each night—with its portrayal of life as a consumers' paradise—thrusts deep into himself, his wife and his children, the full extent as they see it, rightly or wrongly, of their deprivation. Under such circumstances, they are without hope; close to despair. I am fully aware, as I write these lines, that every man, rich or poor, needs more than a bright material prospect to satisfy the longing of his heart. My point here is that he needs a material sufficiency as the conductor of that longing; and that, to deprive him of the means of gaining even that, whilst titillating his taste for material goods (a taste that is in us all) with the prospect of all he *could have* had he *more* than the means of earning a livelihood (which, in fact, he has not even got), will serve only to translate his sense of hopelessness into despair. It is out of this that Bristol, earlier on, and, last July, Brixton 1 and Toxteth, erupted onto the streets. I am not the least bit surprised that, during the riots, they looted. An unemployed youngster, sitting in a shopping precinct, in a midland town, said this to a correspondent: "Looting, everybody does it all the time, but they do it with money; looting without money, what's the difference?" That kid was wiser than he knew. And what did the Tory back-benchers talk about when the Home Secretary addressed them half-way through the riots, if I remember rightly. So far as I could make out, law and order, water-cannon, C.S. gas and plastic bullets. No mention of an unemployed father and a hungry child. But you can't eat plastic bullets. What they can do, at close range, is lodge in your stomach and kill you. Two Nations. What appalled me throughout the time of the riots was the seemingly appalling ignorance of the Tory Establishment as to how the other half lived. In themselves, the economic measures undertaken by the present Government could be thought by many to be in the right direction. Divorced from any real consideration

of social cost, they can be and are seen by the poor, tossed out of work on their account, as no more than an instrument of repression. Unless effective short-term measures are taken to mitigate the plight of the poor and give them hope, last Summer's riots could well be no more than the merest prelude to what is to come. If it does come, the Tory Establishment will have asked for it, not by reason of its economic measures, but because of what appears as its almost total lack of any kind of responsible social sense and concern.

Basic Task of Government

Let us be clear once and for all about this; that the basic task of government is to work for a society in which, at the very, very least, the poorest are not left helpless in their hopelessness, deprived of basic opportunity. This may well require long-term economic measures which are hard to bear, but it is wrong and contrary to social justice that the poorest should be left to bear the brunt of them, not merely alone, but without effective short-term amelioration and without that genuine concern from government and those better placed economically in the community at large, that brings with it grounds for hope. Compassion is not enough in this regard. Too often it slips into condescension that is rightly unwanted. Nothing less is called for than the determined restructuring of society in the interests of the poorest in this country's inner cities. I am perfectly aware that this cannot be done regardless of economic cost, which will have to be taken count of in the future as it has not been in the past. The seed-bed of the present crisis is found in this neglect by previous Governments, whose members knew that economic sense too often made seeming political nonsense and chose economic nonsense instead. The attempt to recover from this has been devoid of social understanding; made to look like an Establishment gig, and which has blown up now in the faces of its progenitors—to the obvious glee of their Labour opponents. This was party politics at its worst; the neglect of the common good in the supposed interests of party advantage. Both Parties were guilty in this respect and it is time both admitted that they were—of giving the appearance, anyway, of using last Summer's

riots to score points off each other. During their course, so many members of both Parties appeared as speaking over the heads of those affected. Where the young, rioting poor were concerned, the politicians must have seemed so much like men from another world. All they got, in answer to their troubles, was, passing over their heads, a torrent of words; verbiage, so far as they were concerned, and nothing more. Readers will remember Question Time in the House of Commons during those July days. It sounded like what? A riot? It was certainly violence; of a verbal sort, but violence all the same. And violence comes out of voicelessness. So it is that, when the representatives of the people in the Mother of Parliaments demonstrate through their disgraceful behaviour in debate that party advantage, not the plight of the poorest that triggered the riots, is their chief and abiding concern, then the poorest know there are none in high places to put their case to those who might try, at least, to do something about it. Under such circumstances, they are left with violence as the only way of bringing their deprivation before the public. And let us realise it. This is just what they have done. In this they have been successful. The tragedy is that they should have been driven to this by the unconcern—as it appeared to them—of those who are supposed, by reason of their public office, to have the welfare of the poorest at heart.

Middle-Class Violence

Neither is violence the prerogative of the poorest. I find it strange, once again, that, when the voiceless erupt onto the streets and start to smash things, they should be branded publicly as violent, which of course they are; whereas, when their so-called betters engage in their own brand of violence, the whole thing is presented in a fashion that is much more low-keyed. During the time of the riots, I wonder how many noticed a report in *The Times* (13/7/81) from its Labour Editor, Paul Routledge, to the effect that :

“Violent attacks on traffic wardens are more likely to be made by respectable people than by criminals, or the underprivileged, according to a TUC report published today.

“In a wide survey, *Violence to Staff*, the unions find that an unexpectedly broad range of private and public-

service employees from bus conductors and rent collectors to social workers, bar staff and shop managers run the risk of assault at work.

"Female traffic wardens are particularly vulnerable to assaults, though not all attacks result in injuries sufficiently serious to justify legal proceedings. In many cases, the assailants are likely to be relatively affluent members of the public whose attitudes tend to cause them to express resentment against staff who have the responsibility of enforcing necessarily restrictive laws and regulations".

And these were the very ones whose voices were raised so loud during the July riots; calling for the harshest kind of police measures in the interests of law and order. But not where they themselves were concerned. Bashing a window in, yes; bashing a female traffic-warden over the head with your brolly, no. One law for the poor and another for the rich; is that what they want? It seems rather like that.

Police and Parliamentary Violence

And the famous (or infamous) police raid on Railton Road, known as Brixton's Front Line, which took place in the very early hours of Wednesday, July 15th, was certainly, in its own way and if allegations published at the time of writing are correct, as violent an operation as those carried out by rioters in the streets of Brixton a few hours before. And what, once again, of the House of Commons? Question time on some of those July days during the riots was the scene of what appeared as a near-riot. Here was violence with a vengeance, yet I have not heard of any proposal to place a water-cannon in the House of Commons in the interests of maintaining order. Was the violence in the streets any worse than that which disgraced the House? I would not think so. If anything, the latter was worse, if only for the fact that those engaged in it were bound and are bound, by their very position, to uphold a particularly responsible code of behaviour, which does not necessarily bind us all as strictly as it does them. The irony of the situation appeared as apparent to few; a riotous Assembly calling for the restoration of law and order which, in its own case, it was failing in singular

fashion to uphold. Not an example of which the House of Commons can be proud and not the first time either. One asks how the Members of that House can be so blind as to expect anyone to take heed of its words in this matter, so long as its own conduct is seemingly in total disregard of them. Credibility goes under such circumstances, and rightly so. Thereby, the invitation to street violence, as the only means of last resort, is stronger than ever.

I incline to the view that at the root of the trouble—the inclination overall to violence, which is on the increase and everywhere apparent in one form or another—there is a feckless self-containment which has laid hold of people long since and which is everywhere apparent in the Western World. The trouble here is the agnostic rationalism which has swept through the educational world, particularly, and laid it bare of Christian values. Conduct is bad because there is no code of conduct now. Men are left only with false Gods. In one sense that is deep and true, the riots last July were a protest by the poor against those who have taken the true God from them and given them idols in His place. The poor have turned against those who have done so. These deserve all they get.

MID WINTER

The rain
Made crystal mirrors in the lane,
And I
Saw, upside down, exquisite tracery
Of winter trees,
And flying birds,
And sky;
A new, enchanted world.
There spoke
Within my heart a voice:
It said: "Rejoice!
Behold the resurrection from the dead:
Be comforted; be comforted".

R. S.

The Author writes "Although written as a fictional letter to a young friend, the content is all fact — from encounters and conversations over some years. Young people, like my family who do not remember the Church of Pius XII need, I think, to be made aware of the sources of today's confusions".

No Generation Gap

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

W. M. QUIRK

MY dear A——,

It is no cause for surprise in any way that you should quite suddenly have become so conscious of the wide disparity of outlook between your new companions and the family and friends amongst whom you lived until last year. You had already realised that, in this country, Catholics are a minority and that when you went to live away from home you would be mostly with people of other religions or none. What has evidently come as a shock is the discovery that nearly all of the Catholics you have met are at variance with you in outlook.

The danger is that you will look on this difference as just another manifestation of the generation gap. Your parents, you may think, are perhaps a little old-fashioned; they have not moved with the times. Your new Catholic acquaintances, on the other hand, are bringing a modern outlook to bear on their religion. I think the explanation lies much deeper than that. Many Catholics have, I am sure, drifted much closer to Protestantism than they realise. A lot of them, if they thought about it at all, would probably describe this as a Good Thing. Are we not encouraged to be ecumenically-minded, to try and understand the other man's point of view, to reach agreement with him over what we believe, and so on? There is no doubt that some have been confused by this sort of persuasion and also by the more out-of-the-way practical examples of the ecumenical

mood; but I suspect that far more damage has been done simply by natural absorption of a Protestant spirit from attendance at the post-conciliar liturgy.

Ever since the celebrated Critical Study of the *Novus Ordo Missae* in 1969, which alleged a "striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass", there have been numerous writings bringing to our attention the Protestant influence that has been brought to bear on our liturgy. We all know about the Protestant "observers" whose views were welcomed by the Commission set up to refashion the Order of Mass. They would hardly have spent so much time in Rome listening to debates and taking part in discussions, had they not felt confident of exerting some influence on the proceedings. Incredible though it may seem, the authorities positively welcomed the influence of people who, by definition, did not believe Catholic teaching on the Mass. (So much for our pre-conciliar confidence that it was for the one, true Faith to spread its influence throughout the world.) The unavoidable conclusion is that our liturgical experts, deny it though they may, at the very least accepted with unconcern that the faithful might be affected by this influence and even acquire a Protestant spirit.

You will not, I hope, think that I am criticising the observers. Why should they not act according to their convictions? All I point out is that the spirit of Catholicism is not a Protestant spirit. To forestall your obvious question, I must tell you how I see the difference. It is not a question of judging anyone's sincerity, or good-will or holiness. It is quite objective. There are many differences of belief and practice between Catholicism and Protestantism but all stem from the fundamental cleavage—the Catholic belief that Christ left behind Him in this world a living teaching authority. This the Protestant churches do not accept. None of them claims such an authority for itself.

Once you perceive this, you will find it easier to assess the present situation. The calculated ambiguity in the *Novus Ordo* about the Mass as a redemptive sacrifice, about the Real Presence, about the priesthood need not be seen as a denial of Catholic doctrine. It is, though, a very clear indication that, after all, doctrine is not so very important;

an indication of comprehensiveness — we can be good Christians, whatever we believe, so why bother? You, of course, are not old enough to appreciate how things have changed, but it strikes me forcibly that I have heard precious little by way of instruction in our parish churches these past fifteen years that might counter this spirit; little that might not have been said in any church or chapel in the country. Just think about it for yourself. How often do you hear firm Catholic teaching of aspects of faith and morals? How often are you reminded of the grounds on which we can rationally justify to others (and to ourselves) our continued adherence to the Church? If your answer is what I think it may be, then you will not be surprised that I refer to a spirit that is not a Catholic one.

The fruits of this spirit are to be found, not so much amongst the friends of your own age who might be tempted to say of the Church's teaching on marriage, for instance: "This is a hard saying and who can bear it?", but amongst their elders, their parents, their chaplains, who are saying such things as: "The Pope is making life too hard for young people" or "It's not X's fault that his wife left him; why shouldn't he marry again"?

A similar incomprehension of the Church's role as teacher may be found amongst those who are quite convinced that, before long, the shortage of priests will have to be overcome by the ordination of women. The suggestion that the Church has down the centuries been following divine precept and may one day feel it necessary to pronounce formally and finally is ruled out as an impossibility with such remarks as: "Rules can always be changed if they are seen to be obstructing progress".

Clearer examples of a Protestant spirit in regard to the teaching authority of the Church it would be hard to find. I must confess that I find the connection in regard to practice even more striking. Many priests, not content with the new Mass they were instructed to use, have quite voluntarily and without any regard for the feelings of their people gone further. They have removed altar-rails and forced their congregations to queue cafeteria-style for Holy Communion. Not a few have ignored the strict ruling of the Holy See and employed nuns and lay-people to administer

Holy Communion in the absence of the very restrictive conditions under which this is permissible. Quite what the objective is behind this sort of thing is never very convincingly explained, but one finds it hard to believe that it is an ingenious new method of increasing reverence and devotion. Is it fanciful to see a connection between such practices and the growing phenomenon in some churches of the great burst of loud conversation which erupts the moment Mass has ended ?

You have heard of the saying attributed to a medieval mystic that, if people could only realize just what it is we have in our churches, it would be impossible to control the crowds determined to gain access. This is the sort of arresting thought which points up the banality of so many recently discovered "insights". God, of course, does not normally grant such overwhelming appreciation of His presence to humans. Nevertheless, it has been age-old Catholic practice to foster a loving, adoring awareness of the Real Presence. So much so that even discreetly-whispered conversations were felt to be out of place. In all too many churches, one may now gain the clear impression that this awareness is in sad decline.

A Protestant spirit ? Or perhaps the celebrated spirit of the Council ? The latter was cited to me lately by Mrs. B—— whom you know to be a practising Catholic. After enthusing over all the liturgical changes which had provided such wonderful opportunities for individual participation, she mentioned that in youth she had been a daily Mass-goer under the old dispensation, but was now a bit sceptical as to how worthwhile it had been. Nowadays, she did not pray between one Sunday and the next. Her work was her prayer. Without criticising the lady, one must say that this is as far from the Church's immemorial spiritual guidance as could be imagined. Yet an intelligent, professional person can be convinced that this is the rule of life appropriate to the post-conciliar era.

When next someone murmurs admiringly to you about the spirit of the Council, remind them of the recent referendum in Italy concerning the abortion law. There was the most devastating commentary imaginable on the so-called post-conciliar Church; that it could not inspire the majority

of a Catholic nation to register a vote against this wholesale slaughter of the innocent.

You have made much of the difference you find in attitudes between congregations in one church and another. You like to feel that you are amongst people who are enthusiastic and you note that this is more often the case when the congregation is young, the priest is cheerful, the hymn tunes are lively and so on; but never the case when you attend a Latin Mass. If we are honest, we must all admit that external demeanour is not an infallible guide to interior disposition but, whatever our preferences as regards music, language, participation, etc., we must remember that a mere feeling of euphoria is not what we are supposed to be aiming for. The young woman who said to us recently : "We don't like our new priest : he makes us feel uncomfortable when he preaches" may be typical of many in your enthusiastic congregation : stop to ask yourself what they are being enthusiastic about. If it is enthusiasm for taking up our cross daily, for amendment of life, for prayer and atonement—the things we are so inclined to defer—then all well and good. You cannot be sure about the others, of course, but it would be a useful thought for yourself before you get carried away by a jolly camaraderie or a vague feeling of benevolence.

Here and there, usually in the humbler of our city churches, you will see what used to be so common, men and women rapt in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament. People over whom the tides of reform have swept without impairing the foundations of their faith. The same faith was handed on to you by the grace of God through the steadfastness of your forebears, generation by generation. Many others with the same inheritance have allowed themselves to be enticed outside the mainstream of Catholic faith and practice by the superficial attractions of novelty and change. A great gulf has opened up, but it is not a generation gap. Youth and age are to be found on both sides. To stay on the right side, you must retain a true Catholic spirit. This requires a conscious resistance, not only to the obvious secularising influences of the day, but just as firmly to the more insidious influence exerted by the Protestant spirit of our modern forms of worship.

Readers will recollect that Mgr. Oliveri's important book, *The Representatives*, received full and complimentary comment in the April, 1981, issue of *Christian Order*. Philip Trower's long review-article of the same book stands in its own right as a first-class appraisal of the contemporary and controversial scenario within which the book is set. It is for this reason that we publish it here with acknowledgements to the American Catholic Weekly, *The Wanderer*. *The Representatives* is obtainable from St. Dut hac's Book Service, 39 Blenheim Park Rd., South Croydon CR2 6BG, United Kingdom at £8.50 a copy and US \$17.00.

The Pope's Men

PHILIP TROWER

IN November last year, 1980, a short book called *The Representatives* appeared in London from one of the smaller publishing houses—as mentioned briefly on page four of *The Wanderer* of Jan. 8th. Its subtitle is “The Real Nature and Functions of Papal Legates”, and at first glance it seemed to be a handbook for specialists in Church government, which one would have expected to sell only a few hundred copies.

And so it might have, but for the appearance shortly afterwards of a long article about it by one of the better-known English journalists, Paul Johnson, in the new international English-language weekly *Now!*

The article was really two articles in one; a straightforward review of the book, and, alongside it, a much more extensive piece discussing the book in the context of the rebellion in the Catholic Church over the last 15 years, and the steps taken by the present Holy Father to master it.

According to Johnson, the book is one of a number of signs that Pope John Paul II, having discovered from his journeys how bad things are, is going to stand no more

nonsense, and that in restoring order his chief instruments and going to be his nuncios and apostolic delegates. Johnson claims that great efforts were made to prevent the book's publication. So far it has only appeared in English in England and the United States.

Opposition as Well as Interest

All this explains why, instead of vanishing from sight for good in the pre-Christmas flood of new books, *The Representatives* is arousing interest, as well as opposition, all over the place.

Some of the interest is no doubt due to Johnson's general description of events—bishops, priests, Religious Orders, etc., defying the Pope. It is not a complete picture, and it lacks light and shade. But Johnson writes from a point of view favorable to the Pope and the Church, and in forceful terms. This is not something the general public is used to.

The Author Knows Whereof He Speaks

The 37-year-old author, Msgr. Mario Oliveri, is on the staff of the Apostolic Delegation in London, and his book is commended by two Cardinals. Giovanni Cardinal Benelli contributes a preface; His Eminence was for ten years Assistant Secretary of State (*Sostituto*) under Pope Paul VI (during which period Msgr. Oliveri worked for two years as his personal secretary), and now as Archbishop of Florence from time to time acts as a kind of roving ambassador for Pope John Paul II. "I am particularly happy", he writes in his preface, "that it is published in English, a language of straightforward communication, which is spoken all over the world". And it is indeed remarkable that the book appeared just as Archbishop Pio Laghi, the new Apostolic Delegate to the United States, the country with the largest number of English-speaking Bishops, was about to take up his post in Washington. Salvatore Cardinal Pappalardo of Palermo writes the postscript; he was for some time head of the Pontifical Academy which trains Papal diplomats. In a preface of his own, Msgr. Oliveri also warmly thanked Giuseppe Cardinal Siri of Genoa, describing himself as the Cardinal's spiritual son. I should also perhaps mention that Msgr. Oliveri has already published a long doctoral thesis

in Italian, of which the present book seems to be a summary.

Turning to the book itself, the first thing one should perhaps say is that it is completely unpolemical and unsensational, as one would expect from a trained diplomat and canon lawyer, not to mention a priest.

The author presents his subject in the form of a commentary on a *Motu Proprio* of Pope Paul VI's, *Sollicitudo Omnia Ecclesiarum*, of June 24th, 1969, which is printed in full at the back of the book. This is the document in which, after the Council, Pope Paul redefined the rights and duties of Papal representatives (the generic name for legates, nuncios, apostolic delegates and lesser envoys). Such a redefinition had been asked for in the Council's decree *Christus Dominus* on the role and office of Bishops.

The War Against the Legates

What then is all the fuss about? Why should tempers be rising and telephones ringing, as it seems they are?

To understand, one has, in the author's words, "to keep in mind the uncertainty about the role of Papal representatives which developed in the wake of the Council, either from within the Council itself or from without".

This is a polite way of saying that the Papal representatives came under attack, like the Curia, as part of the general attempt to limit the Pope's authority.

Actual hostility to the Pope's representatives, which was of various kinds, did not begin with the Council. The Church being run by men not angels, some degree of friction between the different levels of authority will probably always exist, as in every human undertaking. Even in the 1950s it was not uncommon to hear an Apostolic Delegate referred to as "the Pope's spy", and it was not always entirely in joke. Not much harm is done provided hostility does not get beyond the occasional bout of irritable feelings, and that these are tempered by a basically supernatural outlook on the part of all concerned.

More serious, however, as a cause of hostility were the lingering traces of the "Gallican" spirit. This too is something which never completely disappears; in spite of its name, it is at least as old as Constantine's reign and prob-

ably older. It is the Tempter's way of disrupting the Church's unity by suggesting to spiritually unwary bishops that they are the sole divinely appointed guardians of the flock of Christ for their country, or ought to be. In so far as the Pope is conceded any authority, he is seen as a power external to the national Church, whose chief characteristic is that he is a threat to its rights and independence. If every calling has its special temptation, one could call this the special occupational temptation for bishops.

Theological Modernism, which had its own reasons for wanting to weaken the various organs of Papal government, was mainly responsible for launching the attack on the Papal representatives. But it seems to have been able to win a large measure of support from bishops by playing on the weaknesses or minor grievances just mentioned. It had the further good fortune to find in Leo Cardinal Suenens a spokesman for its point of view with a remarkable talent for making bad causes sound like good ones, and for popularizing large general ideas and presenting them as the quintessence of Catholic belief.

Actually the Council did not say much about Papal representatives, apart from asking for their position and powers to be redefined. The matter was left to Pope Paul to deal with. But it was confidently assumed in many quarters that, in keeping with the "new climate", he would considerably curtail their powers and use.

Arguments Opposing the Representatives

The arguments deployed against the use of Papal representatives were of several kinds, and made much play with their two-fold role: the fact that each nuncio or delegate represents the Pope first to the Catholic Church and Hierarchy within the country of his mission (the mission *ad intra* or religious mission); and secondly to the civil government of that country (the mission *ad extra* or diplomatic mission).

Some were only against the mission *ad extra*; contact with secular governments, it was argued, suggests to the world "a Church with a structure analogous to that of political power"; the mission to civil governments "contaminates" that to the churches. If the Church has to have contacts with civil governments, the mission *ad extra* should

be given to a separate representative, preferably a layman. Indeed it would be better if all Papal representatives were laymen. Others were for having the president of the local episcopal conference act as nuncio or delegate on the grounds that he would have a superior understanding of local conditions. Others still were for letting the mission *ad extra* continue, but getting rid of the mission *ad intra*; contact between Rome and the dioceses should be direct (the view of the European Priests' Councils). This was to exclude the nuncio or apostolic delegate from having a voice in the choice of bishops; being a diplomat, it was said, "he is not competent in these matters". Finally there were those who wanted no Papal representatives at all.

One of the peculiar things about the objections to contact with the secular power is that they came from men who in other respects want the Church tangled up in secular affairs as much as possible; and who, while claiming that the Church should be all spirit and no body, see men as all body and no spirit. The inconsistencies of revolutionaries are often highly amusing, or would be if the consequences were not so often a subject for tears.

The Suenens Assault

Such was the state of affairs when in May, 1969, about six weeks before Pope Paul issued the *Motu Proprio* just mentioned, and five months before the stormy 1969 Synod at which a powerful faction tried to subordinate the Pope to the episcopal majority vote, Cardinal Suenens gave an interview to a representative of the news agency *Informations Catholiques Internationales*, published under the title, *The Status and Mission of the Nuncio*, which gathered up all these lesser objections and summarized them in one single master objection : Papal representatives are contrary to the principle of episcopal collegiality and the new insights about the Church of *Lumen Gentium* (the Council's decree on the Church).

(It would be interesting to know whether Pope Paul's *Motu Proprio* was an answer to the Cardinal's assault, or whether the Cardinal had got wind of the *Motu Proprio*, and was trying to forestall its effects.)

This then is what Part One of *The Representatives*, is mainly about — the accusation that Papal representatives

are contrary to episcopal collegiality, and they are so because the kind of authority their use implies is an infringement by the Papacy on the rights of bishops. The author sets himself to show that the charge is based on a misrepresentation of the Council's teaching. (Cardinal Benelli, in his preface, speaks of "wilful misunderstanding".)

Judging in the Light of the Church's Nature

Every office in the Church, Msgr. Oliveri explains, if its existence is to be justified, "must be in harmony with (the Church's) nature . . . and contribute as effectively as possible to its final end"—the union of all her members "in the Love and Grace of Christ." Does the system of Papal representatives satisfy these conditions?

To clear the ground he makes a preliminary point.

In the Church, what was done in the past "often has a dogmatic force or a force of law which is normative for the present." From early times the Popes have sent permanent or temporary legates and nuncios. This therefore in itself is a strong argument in their favor.

"There exist then", he writes, "institutions which while not essential to the organic structure of the Church are, nevertheless intimately related to it, and they are often based on doctrinal principles as a foundation for their existence, to such an extent that the fact of their constant presence in the Church may itself be cited as proof of a doctrinal principle."

(It can be argued in reverse from the same principle that the repeated acceptance of legates by local Hierarchies is a supporting argument for the Popes' special position.)

The author then turns to the main subject in debate, collegiality and the nature of the Church as presented in *Lumen Gentium*. Just what does the dogmatic constitution in fact teach?

It is perhaps well to remember that when people today talk about the Church having new insights, it is often a matter of her bringing to the surface what everyone always understood implicitly, or bringing back into the limelight aspects of her life and teaching which for various reasons had fallen a bit into shadow. "Actually", Msgr. Oliveri writes, "as far as this chapter is concerned"—the chapter in *Lumen Gentium* of which the decree *Christus Dominus*

is the practical application—"the decree contains little that is doctrinally novel."

It is also, I think, worth remembering that any over-emphasis on one aspect of the complex reality of the Church to the disadvantage of others leads to distortion; its two principal characteristics being that it is both a mystical supernatural reality (a communion of believers raised above natural life to "life in Christ") and an organized society with rulers and laws, in this respect like other human societies. When distortion becomes serious, it is usually the basis for a new heresy.

"The characteristics of the Church stressed by the Council," says the author, "have rightly emphasized the primacy of the interior, invisible, spiritual, and charismatic reality over that which is external, visible, temporal, social, and juridical". "The concept of *mystery* 'overrides' that of institution". Similarly "the *spiritual* aspects prevail over the *institutional*". This is as it should be because the institutions are only instrumental, a means to an end. They "are destined to be utterly dissolved with the definitive coming of God's Kingdom."

This shift of emphasis had of course begun long before the Council. Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis Christi* had given it a powerful impulsion. Nevertheless the Council and *Lumen Gentium* brought it wider attention.

Commenting on the more usual ways of describing the Church prior to the Council, Msgr. Oliveri remarks that "an ecclesiology which is too exclusively dependent on the concept of 'society' may well have tended towards certain expressions of the Church's nature which were biased . . . and which neglected other more fundamental aspects".

However this "does not mean that the (existing) ecclesiology was a mistaken ecclesiology." While the institutional aspect of the Church "was given a revised dimension by the Council and assigned a more proper perspective, it cannot be forgotten that it is nevertheless essential to the nature of the Church in its earthly reality". "There would be other risks and gaps in a different sort of ecclesiology which would neglect or even hold in contempt the juridical dimensions of the Church." Pope Paul in his *Motu Proprio* still speaks of the Church as a "perfect society".

"The Church's various characteristics are complementary . . ."

What the Council wanted was simply that the "juridical structures" should express clearly "the fact that their nature is to be of service to the interior communion of Life and Grace." It was part of its more general teaching that all authority should be seen as a service or *munus* (burden); though it did not mean by this that, as servants, those in authority were to spend their time taking orders like waiters, instead of giving them.

Emergence of a Hoary Heresy

All would probably have been well had not the religious innovators, moving in behind the genuine reformers, taken advantage of this particular conciliar "orientation," to decry the institutional element altogether and create a climate of opinion in which any aspect of the Church's government they wanted to get rid of could be made to appear as contrary to the teaching of the Council.

The idea that "the Church ought to labor in the world solely by means of the witness of its members and not through juridical institutions" is a hoary heresy, which has recently been given some pep pills, and had begun to flex its muscles again even before the charismatic movement came on the scene. The only curious thing is that the opponents of an "institutional church" are not opposed to immense ecclesiastical bureaucracies.

So much for the part played by the idea that Papal representatives should be abolished because institutions as such are in some way contrary to the will of God and the Council. However useful in its way, the idea was not one to appeal to the average bishop.

The principle of collegiality was different.

(At the present time it is much easier to say what collegiality is *not*, than what it is. But saying what a thing is not is quite a good way of getting at what a thing is, as theologians are always telling us in reference to God.)

The understanding of collegiality which most quickly gained ground after the Council, even if not explicitly professed, was that the college of Bishops is the entire episcopate *minus* the Pope, and that these two powers

CHRISTMAS GIFT SUBSCRIPTION

I enclose £ for *Christian Order* to be sent for one year to:

Name

Address

.....

.....

.....

Donor's own name and address, please, as follows:

Name

Address

.....

.....

.....

OR : I (name and address as above) enclose £ for *Christian Order* to be sent to reader(s) of the Editor's choosing.

May the Editor remind you that a subscription to *Christian Order* costs £3 or \$5.00 or the equivalent in any currency. Notes are entirely acceptable. The Editor's address is 65, Belgrave Road, London, SW1V 2BG.

stand at the head of the Church as partners, equals, and when necessary, rivals (with the College coming out on top in the case of any really serious conflict). It also came to be more or less taken for granted that any lesser gathering of bishops represents the College and can make final decisions about faith and morals. If this view is right, then that one of the equals should send envoys to supervise the other becomes an intolerable impertinence.

Unique Role of the Bishop of Rome

To these tempting fancies, Msgr. Oliveri opposes two incontrovertible theological facts.

"From the very earliest days," he writes, "there has existed on the part of the Bishop of the Apostolic See of Peter a conviction, repeatedly and consistently expressed that he has a concern and responsibility for all the churches"; and that this role is "special and unique and *not reducible* (my italics) to the care and concern which other bishops too must have for the universal Church." Also, his special concern "can and sometimes must assume an authoritative dimension." The Pope's responsibility for the whole Church, in fact, is different in kind, as well as in degree, from that of bishops, no matter how many their number.

Secondly : "The 'College' of Bishops cannot exist or act if the Head is not present and active within it." (A group of bishops without the Pope and opposed to his rightful authority is not a part of the college but a faction.)

However, to bolster their case (which is essentially Gallican and conciliarist, or episcopalian) the holders of the erroneous view of collegiality have made use of yet another idea put in circulation by the Council; that of "the local church."

"One of the Council's statements which is especially important and fruitful," Msgr. Oliveri writes, "even if expressed with a certain hesitancy, is concerned with the fact that the Church of Christ, one and Unique, is a 'Body of Churches'."

One can see the reasons for the hesitancy.

The term suggests that the Church Universal is nothing but the artificial adding together of separate self-enclosed

"local churches," and that this exercise in simple arithmetic completes the substance and being of the Church. It is seen as a federation of city-states which for the convenience of all have placed themselves, or been placed under, the leadership of one, essentially not different from the rest.

From here it is only a short step to thinking in terms of "national churches" whose bishops' first duty is to erect a Berlin Wall between their people and "Roman interference," the chief embodiment of that interference being the local Papal representative.

This was the attitude of a great many of Europe's Catholic kings down to the First World War. A legate could not enter the country without the sovereign's permission, and was often expelled; Papal bulls and encyclicals could not be published without royal assent, which was often withheld.

Neo-Gallicanism

In the last 15 years we have seen the leaders of not a few Hierarchies starting down the same path in the wake of these royal forerunners, and in the name of "collegiality" and the rights of the "local church." Indeed neo-Gallicanism is now as serious a problem for the Church and the Holy See as neo-Modernism.

(Here too we meet another fascinating inconsistency. The evils of "legalism" are everywhere decried. But no one can be more finickingly legalistic than the Gallican-minded theologian or prelate when it comes to dividing up areas of authority, and, in the case of the Pope's share, measuring it out in millimeters.)

The Council's teaching, as Msgr. Oliveri makes clear, in no way allows for this interpretation, which is based on partial features, not the whole teaching.

Many of today's errors about the Church arise, he observes, because people forget that "the visible structure of the Church is quite *sui generis*." They are always trying to force it to fit some secular political pattern. (It is *sui generis* mainly because most of it is not in this world but in eternity—Heaven or Purgatory.)

When it is said that the Church is a Body or Communion of Churches, it should be noted in the first place that the

term "local church" means a diocese, not—as is frequently implied, the collected dioceses of a particular country—a supposedly American, English, French, or Dutch Church. Secondly, the diocese can only be called a church in a qualified sense; it is a church, not because it is a self-contained whole, but because it is an embodiment of the Universal Church for its particular area. Thus St. Paul speaks of the "Church of God *in* (or *at*) Corinth."

The Parts do not Equal the Whole

But more important still, all the dioceses of the world added together do not make up the Church universal, which is a fuller, more substantial reality within which the local churches must live. In addition to being a Communion of Churches, the Church is a Communion of all the faithful with each other, united by bonds which stretch through and beyond diocesan boundaries. Moreover to belong to the Communion the local churches must all share the same faith, sacraments, and discipline; this in fact is what constitutes it a *Communio*. It is for these reasons that Msgr. Oliveri can speak of the Pope having a special charge in regard to "*all the churches and to the whole Church*" (my italics).

All this explains why the Pope's authority and charisms cannot be seen as something extrinsic to the local churches, something applied from time to time from outside the Church; just as the bishop's authority and charisms permeate every part of his diocese, and in a weaker way radiate out from it on account of his lesser and different concern for the whole Church which he receives from his union with the Pope and his consequent membership in the episcopal College. The two authorities are interwoven, the lesser with the greater, so that the faithful of the diocese give their obedience to both, Pope and bishop, simultaneously, not to one through the other. The Pope's authority is "ordinary and immediate," as well as "supreme and universal," because it is present everywhere all the time.

In this respect, the more spiritualized conception of the Church promoted by the Council has, on the theoretical plane, greatly helped to undermine the "Gallican" position, which essentially sees the Church as a collection of prov-

inches linked to each other only at the top through the bishops.

The chief task of the Pope, then, one could call it his very *raison d'etre*, is to foster the Communion of all the churches and the whole Church by preserving all in the same faith, sacraments, and discipline.

Symbol of the Pope's Universal Presence

There are a number of ways in which he does this; by letter, through the *ad limina* visits of bishops to Rome, through the Synod, through General Councils, and now through journeys abroad. But the practice of sending permanent representatives to each nation, though not essential, has a special value because it symbolizes and makes effective—in a way it is difficult to conceive could be bettered—that universal “presence” and activity of the Pope throughout the Church, and even in a mystical sense “within” each Church, without which the Communion would founder.

Having thus laid the theological groundwork, the author is able to present the Papal representative in a much more exalted and spiritual light than has been customary.

“The pontifical legate,” he writes, “cannot be described simply as a personal representative of the Pope but rather as the representative of the supreme *munus pastorale* (burden of pastoral service) which belongs to the Bishop of Rome.” “He in some way realizes the specific function which the Bishop of Rome should exercise.” Although “not a member of the local churches,” he should become “a participant in their life and he cannot consider himself as standing apart from them.” And since “Communion within the Church and between the churches has a dynamic as well as a static quality” (i.e., it can grow stronger or weaker) it “is always under construction; this makes the representative a minister of Communion between the churches.” Representatives, moreover, are not merely “passive instruments.” “They make an important personal contribution”—though naturally the representative’s “manner of carrying out his mission will largely determine its success.”

However, Msgr. Oliveri is at pains to make clear that the universal “presence” of the Pope throughout the

Church, realized through his representatives, in no way diminishes or extinguishes the just rights of bishops.

"If the jurisdiction of each individual bishop is not preserved," wrote St. Gregory the Great, "we who are guardians of ecclesiastical order would merely sow confusion." Consequently, says Msgr. Oliveri, "none of the tasks of the pontifical representative affects directly the internal life of the individual churches to which he is sent; current legislation does not contemplate any normal function of the legate which will compete with the functions of the bishops." Why should it? It is assumed that bishops will normally be striving to keep the same faith, sacraments, and discipline as the rest of the Church, which it is the Representative's main concern to protect.

Indeed, rather than competing with the bishop's authority, looked at in the right light, the Pope's universal "presence" is seen to be its main support, as well as the guarantee of the bishop's freedom. History shows repeatedly that where the Pope's universal presence is not accepted, the bishop falls under another, and this time truly hostile power, and his freedom to preach the religion of Jesus Christ in its fullness is curtailed. The other power is usually the State. But today, outside the Communist bloc, and especially in Western Europe and North America, it is quite likely to be the local episcopal conference's bureaucracy. How many bishops there must now be sighing to escape from this new tyrant!

Faithful Bishops Support the Pope

However, the flow of support will not always be in one direction. It will also be flowing from faithful bishops towards the Pope, above all when there is a weak Pope, or one who is in difficulties. We shall no doubt eventually learn which bishops showed a truly collegial spirit by helping to strengthen Pope Paul's resolve when it came to issuing *Humanae Vitae*, and in the other crises of his reign. The "college" is a brotherhood, even if one of the brothers has a heavier burden and charge than the rest.

Of course where a bishop does not want to preach the religion of Christ in its fullness, the Pope's authority will naturally be felt as a burden, and the bishop in question

will seek the protection of any worldly power he can find that favors his heterodoxies.

Unity of Faith, Sacraments, Discipline

To sum up Msgr. Oliveri's case, then, Papal representatives are not in conflict with the nature of the Church or collegiality, firstly because the Church is not a purely spiritual society; and secondly because collegiality does not envisage bishops as rivals of the Pope—who can, if they so wish, exclude him from the inner life of their local or “national” churches—but sees the Pope's special activity as permeating the entire College all the time (whether gathered together for a Council, or scattered throughout the world) and also the entire *Communio*. This is the only way in which unity of faith, sacraments, and discipline can be preserved.

The use of Papal representatives is also justified because the essence of their work—even indirectly their mission to civil governments—is to promote the union of the whole Church in the Love and Grace of Christ, which is the Church's final end.

This, according to my reading of *The Representatives* is how we are to understand the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* about the Pope and Bishops, which, far from presenting a theology antipathetic to Papal representation, positively calls for it. No doubt, as Catholics, we already knew most of these things already, but I think anyone who reads *The Representatives* will understand them in a far deeper way. Those who see the local nuncio or delegate as merely a tiresome or superfluous ecclesiastical official, plainly do not have the mind of the Church.

Power and Authority of Papal Representatives

The opponents of the Papal legatine system, having failed to get the Holy See to abandon it, either at the Council or afterwards, have since, it seems, done their best to emasculate it, by denigration, by-passing it, or trying to take the local nuncio or delegate into camp.

Part Two of *The Representatives* therefore, is designed to re-establish the nuncios' and delegates' authority in practice. It sets out their specific rights and duties as laid

down in Pope Paul's *Motu Proprio*. (*Sollicitudo Omnis Ecclesiarum*.)

In the first place, it is made clear by the *Motu Proprio* that before sending a Representative, the Pope does not have to have the consent of the local Hierarchy, nor can it dictate to him whom it will or will not receive, or lay down conditions. One has the impression that a lot of this has been attempted, when not actually happening.

The author then explains why, although Papal Representatives can be laymen, Pope Paul says they are to be priests and normally bishops.

According to the Code of Canon Law : "The Sacrament of Orders separates by Christ's intention, the clerics from the lay people for the governing of the faithful and for the ministry of the divine cult" (Canon 948).

Therefore, the author says, "it is not at all clear why Bishops ought in a normal way to entrust the role of being cooperator in the actual function of the episcopal office to the laity when they have the possibility of turning to those who have been made such by their sacramental ordination." In any case, lay people do not have any "right" to be made episcopal cooperators.

Common sense also suggests less exalted reasons for not having lay representatives : the possibility of the apostolic nuncio and his wife turning up at discotheques and night-clubs.

The reasons for episcopal consecration are self-evident; it enhances the nuncio's or delegate's dignity and authority. In addition, as a member of the episcopal College, a bishop will be a better symbol of the Pope's universal care—titular bishops being just as much members of the College as diocesan bishops.

The idea that the president of the local episcopal conference or another local bishop will necessarily make a better representative than a bishop of different nationality has little to support it. In one way of course, a local bishop will know his country better, but he may well have a much more parochial view of it; most of us have an exaggerated idea of our country's virtues. He is also much more likely to put the interests of his own country before those of the whole Church, as history shows. Cardinal Wolsey is a case in point.

Among the representative's regular duties, the first in importance, according to the author, is seeing that there is a flow of accurate information in both directions. This is his day to day way of promoting and preserving Communion between the local churches and the whole Church, as gathered under the Holy See.

No Berlin Wall

And no one may impede this flow of information. Individual bishops, priests, lay people "all retain complete liberty to communicate their proposals, opinions, and possible complaints directly to the Holy See . . . which reserves the right to ask the Pontifical Representative to give his views on whatever has reached the Holy See direct". There is to be no Berlin Wall.

"At the same time the Offices of the Roman Curia will communicate to the Representatives the decisions of their departments, so that — if necessary — they can explain them". It sounds as if the flow of information in the reverse direction has sometimes been by-passing the nuncios and delegates.

The Representative is also "to be regarded as the interpreter of the true meaning of . . . initiatives and teachings of the Holy See" to governments.

Next on the list of duties is advising the Holy See on the choice of bishops. The author calls this task "extremely delicate and full of potential consequences for the life of the Church." One feels this is an understatement. The very survival of the Catholic Church in certain countries today plainly depends on the right choice of bishops.

In carrying out his duty "the legate will avail himself of the advice of ecclesiastics and also of prudent lay persons . . . and they must guarantee secrecy." He is also "entitled to propose as candidates additional names which are not actually on the list"—provided by the local Hierarchy.

When there is question of creating new dioceses, or dividing or merging existing ones, the Representative can "promote the study of such matters even on his own initiative when it is required."

Tendency Toward National Churches

Episcopal conferences have raised many new problems for the Holy See and its representatives. Though excellent

where Hierarchies are all doctrinally sound, where they are not, they seem to encourage the drift towards national churches.

The conciliar decree *Christus Dominus* says that "the legates of the Roman Pontiff are not by right members of the conference."

But at the time of the Council, Msgr. Oliveri observes, "the theological and juridical nature of such an institution had (not) yet been fully determined. The danger of an over-evaluation of such an institution should not be overlooked, as this would risk harming the initiative and autonomy of every bishop."

In support of this opinion Msgr. Oliveri quotes Fr. de Lubac, an authority whom no one can suggest has a "pre-conciliar" mentality.

"The primary purpose of episcopal conferences," Fr. de Lubac writes, "is on the practical level and their effectiveness depends on limitation to this purpose. Their work does not normally constitute in itself an exercise of collegiality. *Lumen Gentium* recognizes no doctrinal intermediary between the local and the Universal Church. It would amount to corruption of an excellent institution, and one which is extremely opportune, but not totally essential, if it were to be confused to a greater or lesser extent with the institution of the episcopal College" (*L'Osservatore Romano*, Nov. 2nd, 3rd, 1971).

Pope Paul's *Motu Proprio* lays down that although the Papal representative is not a member of the episcopal conference *ex officio*, he will be present at the opening session of every assembly, and will furthermore participate in other acts of the conference upon invitation of the Bishops themselves, or by explicit order of the Holy See.

In addition, "the legate will be informed in adequate time of the questions which will be dealt with by the conference"; and "at the end of the meeting he will receive a copy of the proceedings, in order to study them and forward them to Rome."

And the author concludes: "the presence of the legate of the Bishop of Rome . . . is in fact a sign that decisions reached can only reflect the close links and great attention

which individual Churches should maintain with the whole Church, since their life is to be preserved in harmony with the life of all."

Responsibility to Religious Communities

The Papal representative has the same position and same duties in regard to meetings of the conferences of religious superiors, male and female. Obviously these too have been in need of supervision.

Finally the author deals with the representative's mission *ad extra*, to the civil government.

Commenting on Cardinal Suenens' idea that contact between the Papal representative and the civil rulers means that "the voice of the poor is not heard," Msgr. Oliveri makes what is perhaps the only slightly sardonic comment in the whole book. "The power to evaluate and to suggest what can be useful to the needs of the poor in a given situation"—through discussion with those responsible for their life and conditions—"is worth more than publicized demagogic statements and attitudes."

All the objections to the mission *ad extra*, as we saw, are based on a false idea that the Church ought not to be a visible organized society. Given that the Church is a visible society—even though her goals are different from those of other human societies—and that her members are at the same time members of the secular State, contacts with the rulers of the secular State, and the Church's membership, as a social body, of the international community, are obviously necessary and unavoidable.

Fundamentally a Religious Mission

There is no reason why the mission *ad extra* should give an impression of a Church interested in worldly power—except to prejudiced people—provided her representatives are spiritual men. The Representative is not an ambassador of the Vatican City State, but represents the Pope as Supreme Pastor of the Church. The purpose of the mission *ad extra*, even if described as diplomatic, is ultimately just as much religious as the mission *ad intra*. Anyone can see how much worse off the Church would be without nuncios and delegates to explain the intentions of the Church to

civil rulers, clear up misunderstandings, and generally help safeguard the local churches' rights and freedom.

The Church also wishes it to be known that she is interested in men's temporal welfare, even if her main object is getting them to Heaven. This is the justification for sending Papal representatives to international bodies and congresses with purely humanitarian aims. It is a kind of preaching by example. She also hopes to instil, as needed, some right principles.

I hope by now I have managed to show that *The Representatives* is a book of primary importance, which has to do with far more than the running of the Papal diplomatic service; and also that in addition to its practical purpose it has great theological importance. The author, it seems to me, has made a major contribution to the proper understanding of collegiality, the true significance of *Lumen Gentium*, and the nature of the Papal office.

This may not be so apparent at a first reading because the author is dealing with basic principles, and the result is therefore somewhat concentrated. However, since the book is short, a second reading, or even close study, is not time consuming, and is well worthwhile. Throughout, the author looks at things from a supernatural standpoint, and the presentation of his case is marked by moderation and balance.

Recommended Reading

Study is made easier by the fact that short key paragraphs are in slightly bolder type. The English edition is unfortunately very expensive; this was probably unavoidable; the publishers could not know what kind of reception the book would get. But now that an inexpensive paperback edition is being made available by *The Wanderer*, I would do everything you can to get a copy; not just for instant reading, but for later reflection and reference. The book says nothing that could give offence to any truly Catholic bishop, nor I think will it. The author shows the greatest respect for the true rights and dignity of bishops. Many will probably welcome the book, seeing their deliverance from bureaucratic bondage at last coming near.

In this respect, Paul Johnson's article in *Now!*, with which I began, could be misleading, both in what it says about the book and about the Holy Father's intentions.

Johnson makes generous use of expressions like "the autocratic and unlimited powers of the Pope," "rigorous and adamantine assertions of Papal authority," "the mailed fist," "crushing discontent," and "tough-minded men from the Vatican."

This does not portray at all accurately the ideals set out by Msgr. Oliveri, or what seem to me the Holy Father's method of governing the Church. If anything has marked Pope John Paul's Pontificate so far it is surely that he knows how to make himself felt with the least possible outward disturbance. He is obviously very much aware how close the possibility of a public schism still is in many countries of the West, and in re-establishing order seems anxious to do it in a fashion that makes the way back to obedience as easy as possible for any straying sheep or shepherds who look as if they might be thinking of returning to it. Firmness exercised with a kind of holy guile seems to me much more characteristic of the steps he has so far taken.

A New Wind is Blowing

However, no one is going to question Johnson when he speaks of "abundant evidence that in recent years many thoroughly undependable or even actively mutinous bishops have been selected", and the publication of *The Representatives* seems a clear sign that this is going to stop; the Holy See will be expecting a different kind of treatment for its Representatives, and a different kind of Representative will be choosing a different kind of bishop.

Manifestly it is not a question of choosing so-called "conservative" bishops rather than so-called "liberal" or "progressive" ones, but of choosing bishops who both understand the Council's teaching properly and are fully Catholic in faith and morals.

The theory that a "progressive-conservative" disagreement about reform is any longer at the root of the troubles is one of the great pseudo-theories of the 20th century.

The picture presented in this short, but trenchant article is true, not only of the United States, but of this and many other countries. Religious education, as presented today, is destroying Catholic Belief, not promoting and strengthening it. It is thus an inversion, as such, a farce. The laity have known this for years. Their representations to priests, religious and bishops on this subject have been, for the most part, in vain. It is time they were taken count of before it is too late. This is the twenty-fifth hour. Acknowledgements to *The Wanderer*.

Destroying Belief

(POST-CONCILIAR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION)

MSGR. NELSON LOGAL

THE NCEA (National Catholic Education Association) opened its 78th national meeting in New York on April 21st in a mood of optimism triggered by statistical awareness that enrolment in Church-related schools is on the upswing. However, the members also faced a moment of truth about the quality of the religious education being offered in Catholic schools in attending to the McCready opinion poll on religious attitudes sampled among 4,000 U.S. and Canadian Catholics ranging in age from 14 to 30. Seventy-five percent of the young Catholics sampled do not believe in the infallibility of the Pope; more than 90 percent reject the Church's anti-birth control stand; only 17 percent believe that premarital sexual relations are wrong; only 11 percent agreed that divorced people may not remarry without the Church's sanction; and only 37 percent attend Mass every week. The Catholic attitude against homosexuality and abortion-on-demand met higher acceptance. Belief in life after death netted 64 percent agreement.

If the members of the NCEA looked at these statistics as saying something about the *quality* of religious education

in Catholic schools their optimism must have been severely tempered. The McCready poll confirmed what critics of religious education have been maintaining for a long time. It is destroying belief not teaching it. All the respondents in the poll spent the greater part of their lives in the "renewal" of religious education under the sway of many revisionist theologians, moralists, teachers, and educational bureaucrats. One can only hope that the revelation will prompt the educators to realize the monumental failure in religious instruction during the "renewal" (perish the word) era following Vatican II.

Personally, I was surprised that the gloomy percentiles were not much higher in view of the revisionist propaganda that has been prevalent in the Church during the past two decades. Parents have been screaming protests against the failures of religious teachers to teach the faith for a long time. Children have been withdrawn from schools because the reverse-nature of their religious instruction has been judged to be worse than no religious education at all.

The McCready Poll certainly highlighted the revisionist ruins of religious education. Just as the city of Atlanta was a show case of the devastation wrought in Sherman's "March to the Sea" at the end of the Civil War, so is the McCready report a sign of the "Devastated Vineyards" of Catholic religious education in the Post-conciliar Church of the United States and Canada where belief, moral attitudes, and religious practices have been put through the shredder of "updating." Pope John XXIII must be turning over in his grave as he witnessed the havoc which has followed in the wake of his *aggiornamento*. The fresh air that entered the Vatican when he opened that symbolic window was a gentle breeze but it became a cyclonic fury as it left the Vatican and raged through the Church on the wings of "The Spirit (not the letter) of Vatican II."

One cannot help but wonder how long it will take and how many polls will be necessary to impress upon the minds of our theologians, moralists, scriptural scholars, educators, bishops, priests, and teachers the enormity of the damage to which they have been parties.

McCready suggested that there are two ways to characterize the rejection of doctrinal and moral teachings as revealed by his poll.

1. "Young people do not feel compelled to leave the Church when they disagree with it."

2. "The moral values of the laity seem to be veering further and further away from those advocated by the Church, which might be an unhealthy situation."

He sees a positive side to all this: "the great majority of those born Catholic remain Catholic and the Church is speaking to them at some level."

So much for McCready's crippled optimism.

I would suggest that both the McCready characterizations are unhealthy. In neither case would I blame the phenomena noted on our young people. They have been victimized by the dissent, uncertainties, and incompetence of their teachers and their text-books. The poll shows how sadly the lambs stray when their shepherds mislead them. In the cacophony of contestation inside the Church, it is a great wonder that any faith is left among the young.

They are the victims of the revisionist "renewal" in which our schools, pulpits, journals, textbooks, and grapevines have participated. The 18th Century's Enlightenment ended in a reign of terror. Our 20th Century's "Renewal" has ended in a reign of dissent which has spread confusion and chaos. What else could have been expected with so many errant teachers, permissive bishops, disloyal colleges and heretical journals parading under the banners of renewal.

The result of polls on religious attitudes are predictable in such an age as we have been living through. One cannot help but recall the drama related in the sixth chapter of *St. John's Gospel*. Christ was proclaiming His eucharistic presence. The huge crowd listened to Him and then cried out, "This is a hard saying, who can bear it?"

St. John commented: "Many went back and walked no more with Him."

Jesus watched them leave. Then He turned and challenged His disciples, "Will you also go?" Peter met the challenge and made his beautiful confession of faith.

For years our young people have been bombarded on all sides with the pressures of their times — the pressures of sensuality, pride of life, pride of possessions, delight in licence, etc. In their schools and in their pulpits, in too many cases, they have heard only the cracked voices of

dissent, debate, and contestation, reaching down to the very bedrock of faith and morals. Their textbooks have secularized the content of their religious studies, their teachers have been uncertain trumpets, their moralists have shaken their certainties in unbending moral standards. For 20 years they have been exposed to sceptical questions and flaccid interpretations of faith. Is it any wonder that they answer poll-taking questions as they do? The greater wonder is that even smaller percentiles of disagreement with their Church have not appeared.

Fr. Holloway, a great English catechist and journalist, recently wrote :

“There is no myth, nor ignorance in the Revelation of God, in the person of God, in Jesus Christ . . . there is only the divine condescension of coherent, God-given development. . . There is no pluralism of doctrine, nor pluralism of moral perfection in the true faith of Christ and the true tradition of Jesus Christ. That is why men like Hans Kueng are always at odds with the true doctrine and moral perfection of their Church. They have made God and Jesus to their own image and likeness. But the real Jesus of human history and human fulfilment lives on in the coherent development and straight line growth of common doctrine and doctrine refined in the fires of heresy and contradiction through many a Council, and many a Petrine confirmation of the brethren. This testimony deepens through time and surges to new heights in every crisis of the history of the Church and of mankind. Doubters and agnostics have got to explain it” (*Faith*, Vol. 13, No. 12, pp. 2 and 3).

“The verbalization of the Christian message has no effect unless it is incarnated in the lives of those who profess to have accepted it”.

—Fr. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, O.P.

It is the Editor's view that Henry Edwards has rarely written more profoundly or with greater insight than in the article that follows. It might not be too much to say that the heart of the trouble that plagues the Church today is here laid bare.

Silence, Worship and the Mass

(“There was silence in Heaven, as it were for half an hour”
Appoc. VIII 1.)

HENRY EDWARDS

I AM sure that, increasingly at present, the chief means used to try and end the debate within the Church concerning the New Mass is to avoid debate. Someone like Mr. Michael Davies will produce the most painstaking work concerning the tendentiousness of the new rite. He will be applauded by a quite large number of diligent Catholics. He will be carefully ignored by the Progressive Establishment, who will proceed as before. It is essential that he should take no count of their affected disdain.

Perhaps I am too lazy or too old or too deprived to engage in the sort of research done by Mr. Davies. On the other hand, it may be that I still have something to offer; a different kind of criticism of the New Mass, because my upbringing was a Quaker one. It is true that I need someone like Mr. Davies to show me that the new rite tends towards that of Anglicanism; but as I never had much experience of the anglican “way”, despite having had an education in an English public school, I am not likely to find this kind of fault in the new rite unless it be shown me. From my earliest years I was, however, trained to think of worship and to see that *silence is its best basis*. One must not suppose that Quietism was condemned on such a ground. Quietism was condemned because it would have nothing but the prayer of quiet even to the point of denying the excellence of prayers that asked for something; e.g. our daily bread.

Space alone hinders me from citing the many doctors of Holy Church who have recommended silence. The anchorites alone show the praxis. The mistake made by the Quakers was to suppose that worship was contradicted by chant and preaching; but then even they will pray audibly, and speak in their Meeting for Worship. I have even heard a woman sing a hymn at a Westminster Meeting. But we may mistake "silence" here. The silence we must have in mind is a *spiritual* one rather than a *mere absence of sound*, as Quakers themselves would testify, such as those who continued their Meetings during air raids in the last war.

It is the burden of this article to assert that the new rite destroys this fundamental silence. I have worshipped at the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom at which a choir sings almost all the time; but I have not been disturbed by the singing from worshipping in silence. Such silence is at the middle, so to speak, just as the chant is at the outside. One might indeed compare this with the eye of a cyclone were it not for the destruction the cyclone causes. It is, at least in terms of church history, but a very short time ago that Catholics were being very fervently encouraged to read certain spiritual classics of which the easiest to read, if the hardest to follow, is the *Imitation of Christ*. Such classics, in one way or another, proposed for the reader a personal encounter with Our Lord both through and side by side with the Sacraments. I know exactly what happened. Of a sudden came a new theology, which grossly overemphasised the community or social aspect of the Faith to the point of roundly denying the worth of private devotion.

Pius XII warned against this error, notably in his great Encyclicals, *Mediator Dei* and *Mystici Corporis Christi*, where he also warned against Quietism, concerning which I gave earlier a practical example. During the era of Quietism, such a work as Father Baker's *Sancta Sophia* was under suspicion, but on closer examination it was freed. Of it E. I. Watkin has written that it provided a balanced spirituality. Father Baker, a Welsh Benedictine, whose work was published at Douai by the Benedictines, was eager to offset a false piety which seemed to him to

consist of jumbling together "frequent confessions, vocal voluntary prayers, hearing of Masses (Daniel Rops writes of some not so good Catholic who would hear half-a-dozen Masses a day), set devotions, exercises to saints, prayers for the dead, solicitous cares to gain indulgences, going to such and such churches, joining many confraternities, entangling oneself with vows. . ." Pius XII wrote the same (para. 197, *Mediator Dei*): "The Christian life does not consist in a multiplicity of different prayers and devotional practices". Somewhere there exists "the Catholic Centre", to which "Community" Catholics and "pius" Catholics should be drawn.

To gain that Centre today we do not need Father Baker's warning, given in a day when too many Catholics sought to gain merit by going in for a spiritual Licorice-all-Sorts. The warning which is needed today is that too many Catholics will seek merit in what is no more than philanthropy and social service; and, indeed, the new form of "*Ite Missa est*" seems to mean, "Now that Mass is over, get out as fast as possible and get on with the world of laborious work (*labor* rather than *opus*)". I know well that large numbers of Catholics, clerics and layfolk, believe that divine worship is for "the world". They may not put it in that way; but that is what they must really mean. We have here a grave insubordination of ends. Moreover, the older concept of *opus* is almost gone; and in its place has come the intellectual worker (the labourer). That is very clear in Marxist-ridden lands; but the Marxists are more honest in this. We can easily deceive ourselves; e.g. by saying: "Going to Mass helps me to live a better (see 'fulfilling') life". Of course, it should help in that way; but that is not the supreme object of Mass.

It is hard to escape the utilitarian. In the 18th century someone like Defoe set an example of trying to show that religion joined with hard work would prove its worth. The industrious apprentice would prosper. An Old Testament interpretation was given to an O.T. text : "I have been young and I have been old, yet I have never seen the righteous forsaken or his seed begging bread". If the more strictly theological doctrine of Calvin were set by, there was a practical application of it, as I know from listening to Calvanist members of my own family, who believed with

great conviction that someone who had come down hard in the world bore the mark of reprobation. Let us say that, of course, we will have none of that. Are we so sure? Among my relatives I would hear the little jingle:

"A Sabbath well spent, brings a week of content, and
rest from the cares of tomorrow".

I know that something like this may be found among us. The cure is to look once more at worship—adoration.

"Dazed with the noise and speed I run
and stay me on the Changeless One.

I stay myself on Him who stays
ever the same through night and days :
The One Unchangeable for aye
That was and will be : the one Stay.
I stay myself on a great quiet
After the tumult and the riot."

Alice Curtayne

I know also that there are experts who have for some years been doing what they think is their best—a condescending best—to tell us layfolk that sort of piety is "No Go" for us, even if it is "Go" for a few special souls. I have not believed them, because I have seen far too many Catholics of all conditions staying quietly in a church for an hour or so — doing what? One answer is, "doing nothing". I mean doing nothing in the sense that Mary was not doing anything when her sister, Martha, was making a noise with the crockery. The famous words of that poor man to a priest, "I am looking at Him and He is looking at me", are apt, in this context.

But the return is hard. It must be especially hard for Catholics younger than, say, thirty years and most hard for adolescents who have every reason for believing that God must be addressed as the false prophets addressed Baal : "Call him louder", "Perhaps he is on a journey". "But do you, dearly beloved, if you are making your inward ear ready for this Voice of God that is sweeter than honeycomb, flee from the outward cares. This Voice sounds not in the market place and is not heard in public. It is a secret purpose and seeks to be heard in secret". So wrote St. Bernard. Anyone who says he is not good enough errs. Of course, none of us are good enough. That is precisely

why we are bidden to this act of worship. "If you wait till you are better, you will never come at all" runs an old Evangelical hymn.

Permanency and Change

There is, however, a secular aspect to which I must turn. I first began to spot it before I became a Catholic. Offhand I cannot be sure of the source of the statement I read which had this purport : "In our time there is a deliberate attempt to destroy the classic thing, the virtual denial of permanency throughout change". I remember that even then — some fifty years ago—the illustration given me and others was a deliberate attempt to get rid of the teaching of Latin or some other frozen tongue. Anglicans have recently experienced the attempt to put on one side the incomparable English of Cranmer which is with some justification worth calling a half-frozen tongue. In Wales, a serious controversy led Saunders Lewis, a Catholic, to defend what I may call Classical Welsh against *Cymraeg Byw* (Living Welsh), which some don wanted in its place. Saunders Lewis showed that in the Chapel at all levels and in other places where Welshmen spoke gravely, classical Welsh was always rightly used, not the Welsh of the market place or the kitchen. I know that my mother-in-law, a faithful member of a Welsh Baptist Chapel, would have been upset were proceedings at Chapel spoken in her own Vale of Glamorgan Welsh or Rhondda Welsh or Gwynedd Welsh or some other example of "living Welsh". But how far have we gone ? We can buy a Catholic book (I think it is part of the Bible) in Lobscoos. Some might reasonably argue that such a publication lowers the tone. I do not here make that case. I am pointing out that we have here examples of a flight from the classical. We must not for a moment, they say, make even a faint attempt at trying to seize upon what is not transient.

Consider that great passage from Augustine—his conversation with his mother St. Monica at Ostia: "We said then: if the tumult of the flesh were hushed; hushed these shadows of earth, sea, sky; hushed the heavens and the soul itself, so that it should pass beyond itself and not think of itself; if all dreams were hushed and all sensuous revelations and every tongue and every symbol; if all that comes and

goes were hushed. They all proclaim to him that hath an ear : ‘we made not ourselves : He made us who abideth for ever’. Just now (let us suppose) we reached out and with one flash of thought touched the eternal Wisdom that abides above all. Of course, as he knew, this was not quite possible, not, that is, even to the greatest of praying pilgrims. We are always bound to see through a dark glass. But that we should look through a dark glass, is that not able Catholics reached out at Mass, if only that the old rite gave them the chance. Perhaps they still have some chance. But they are not supposed to have it. The new rite is set within the modern mood, which is nothing if it is not hostile to the very word “stay”. Without doubt these farmers would reject outright Pascal’s almost timeless moment in the year 1654, not because they deny it but because it is of no use to their ends.

Words, Heavenly and Otherwise

St. Paul, and to a lesser extent St. James and St. Peter, provide us with the word “conversation” (in old-fashioned translations). For example, “Our conversation is in heaven” (Philip. 3, 20). I expect that most of us understand that this does not mean talking or any longer discourse, though all that may well be included. I find that the word is variously changed in later translations, not, I believe, always to advantage. As I see it, the idea is akin to behaviour as citizens of the Heavenly Kingdom (the Welsh indeed has the word for citizenship*). Of course, it would be silly to suppose that the Christian cannot talk about everything without adding some pious word or phrase (I regret that I have met a species of Evangelical who sprinkles almost any sentence with just that sort of stuff which may brand him only too easily as a hypocrite). St. Paul hopes that the Christian will be aware from time to time of *the* real (heavenly) world to which he belongs (by grace) rather than the world which even Christians tend to think is *the* real world. I have underlined *the*. I am trying to suggest that there are degrees in reality and that this world of time together with all those terrifying galaxies is a true icon of

* *Nostra vera civitas in caelis est*; so Latin also has *citizenship*.

the utterly real. The Christian is bidden to see in it a representation of God or even more a transparency through which God may shine. It is close to being sacramental, a visible external sign which God has given us so that He may become present to us. This is a step towards knowing God by revelation. If we stay looking at the icon, we are good pagans. Now we are members of his Church. In the Mass, but also indeed in the other sacraments, we are able to *abide* in God. People who tell me they are usually confused when trying to make a formal act of thanksgiving may very well have grasped this truth. They have, that is, no proper words. There are no proper words save that in our human weakness God is indulgent to us who try to say something sensible.

Something of this grasp of *the* real world may well stick to us in other matters. In what people call politics we may find much talk about preferring policies to personalities; but very seldom are we told to think first of principles. The Christian—yes, and many another man who has some grasp of God—ought to look if he can at principles. Perhaps he will not find them. I have in mind one political party which I tend to support and which for years has had policies. These policies are, as not a few others agree with me, hardly any better than means to get votes. Again, in my own land, most of the political parties vie with each other in making sooth with “the Welsh Radical Tradition”. The remaining party for some odd reason never questions the sooth, though I know of two Welshmen who have shown the sooth to be no more than that. Although they made their case and, although they have been quite generously considered by the Welsh Press, what happens is that the politicians wait until they assume hardly anyone has retained any impression of the impact made by the two, so that the politicians may resume where the two left off. No doubt the same “policy” is used against the critics of the new rite. Goebbels did no better.

Meanwhile the classic thing must be lost. Instead, there is turbulence and agitation and mere movement which are confused with liberty and progress. These new men establish instability and order disorder. The only rebel is he who is right only at the moment of revolt. The revolution

leads such men more than they lead it. It seems almost necessary that Robespierre should be the victim of his own terror. My own limited experience has yet shown me that quite sincere people who like to be thought liberally minded sooner or later find themselves at a stand. What has gone wrong, they will ask. They are probably the most guilty, but for the fact that they are so conscientious. They have not kept themselves really unspotted from the world; that it, from the flux of things.

Loving God with all our Mind

I return to what I wrote about earlier: the condescending attitude of periti to the laity; that is, to almost all of them (excluding religious). Some years ago I discovered I was gravely erring in thinking and talking and writing about "ordinary" Catholics, that is, the bulk of the laity. Mr. T. S. Eliot in his most valuable little book, *The Idea of a Christian Society*, written just after the war, brought us to examine the laity in a manner not, after all, novel. It was, I believe, Coleridge who was careful to think of a constituency he called "the clerisy". Such a constituency might be regarded as too small; but it might be considered as the beginning of a "snowball". The idea of a clerisy was well understood in the Middle Ages. It included the ordained clerics, of course, but all sorts of people clerics. The word "clerk" survives still in spite of the computer; and in the United States a shop assistant is called a clerk.

In 1870, Forster's Education Act was passed. It provided for free, that is, compulsory education for all. When I was still young enough to believe there might be Martians, I read among the pages of that shopping clerk, H. G. Wells, whose belief in this sort of education was quite extraordinary. Today, his belief is probably held more or less by most adults in these isles and elsewhere; and it is crass. The Act, thought Wells, was explicitly designed to enable the U.K. to compete with German exports, not for the creation of "clerks" in the archaic sense. It is not surprising that today a word like "academic" has nothing whatever to do with a Platonic philosopher or a scholar and means, in fact, something or someone impractical or irrelevant (for the world of labour). I never knew and still do not know anything of consequence about education in Catholic schools; but I am

fairly sure that it has to be geared to the same course as education in secular schools. Bung on top religious knowledge like icing and leave it at that. I am not at all surprised to find that pretty well anywhere the layfolk to whom I speak shrink from being thought of as in any way knowledgeable about such subjects as the Bible. The abiding impression I have is that they do not believe they really ought to know. I might once have been pardoned for thinking that this was due to penal days. I do believe that today it is being virtually taught them. Once it was taught by some priests from their quasi-Irish houses. There cannot be many of that valiant generation left. In spite of the growing number of young Catholics going to a university; in spite of much that passes as literacy, there is no equal growth in the number of a Catholic clerisy in Eliot's sense.

I have made several practical tests. In spite of the alleged increase in an understanding of the divine liturgy now that it is in jargon, I have found in several quite different places that many layfolk are utterly unaware of the Eastern Rites. Indeed, I spoke to several who had watched the Mass for the last papal coronation and who had actually seen a Greek deacon and choir chant the Gospel, but who afterwards had no recollection of it at all. I was once tempted to insert something during my reading of an epistle. I felt sure no one would notice. Do not call me in this an intellectual snob. On the contrary. What I am suggesting is that people who copy trade-union jargon and talk of rank-and-file Catholics must mend their speech. Large numbers of Catholics are perfectly capable of understanding their Faith very much better. It is not so simple a matter as their not wanting to know more. The difficulty is subtle : they have a feeling that they are not supposed to want to know more. The New Teachers write as if to mental defectives.

Many years ago a well-intentioned scholarly Protestant showed me what the Council of Trent called for from literate people; e.g. how they should properly celebrate Sunday. Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* almost repeated this as a strong recommendation. I seldom act on it; but I think he was right. *Venite Adoremus*. With the Gregorian (Tridentine) Rite this is so easy.

The following is the text of a talk Cardinal Arns presented at the *Catholic Worker* on May 22, 1981. Dom Paolo has been the Cardinal Archbishop of Sao Paulo, Brazil, the largest archdiocese in the world, for 11 years. He is well known for his strong and active support of human rights, and advocacy of the workers and the poor.

The Heart of the Gospel

PAOLO EVARISTO, CARDINAL ARNS

WHILE I was still in Brazil, I received a letter from Peggy Scherer of *The Catholic Worker* asking me to speak with you this evening and to share something of importance in our Latin American Church with you of the North American Church. As my mind passed from El Salvador down to Argentina, one thing impressed me most. The story of the Latin American Church is the story of the defence of life. From north to south and from east to west our people are dying — some in the hands of the many enemies of life and others from the condition of their lives — hunger, sickness, overwork and filth.

Peggy also wrote me of the thirty-six thousand people who walk the streets of New York City, homeless and defenceless. She wrote of the lessening of aid to the poor and of the increase in spending for atomic weapons. This made me think that perhaps for you, too, a reflection on life as the center of the Christian message would be useful.

The theme of Life is the very heart of the Gospel. Jesus defines Himself as the Way, the Truth and the Life. He defines His mission as giving life and giving it in abundance. And He says of His Father : He is not the God of the dead —but of the Living.

This Life came into the world, and St. John tells us that that is where the conflict begins. John describes this world as that of darkness, lies, slavery and death. And he describes the Kingdom of God as light, truth, freedom and

life. The eternal struggle of the Christian is now marked out : one must spend one's life struggling against the interests of this world because they are not the interests of the Kingdom.

A theologian from El Salvador, Jon Sobrino, said to us last year that in Latin America it is subversive to defend life; I agree with him, but I would go even further: in every part of this world it is subversive to defend life. St. John already told us why. The systems of this world are based on the *interests*—not of the majority, but of a few. And for the few to project their interests it is necessary to have darkness, lies and death.

In El Salvador the land is owned by fourteen families. For them to keep their land, ten thousand people died last year, including two nuns from this very city.

The Gospel Attacked

I was visited last year by a group of European theologians, advisors to their country's bishops. They told me of their solutions for Brazil's social problems and I said to them : But then half of our people would die ! And do you know what they answered me ? They said : Good : Half of your population could live very well if the other half died ! My friends, they were speaking of seventy million people dying.

Is the system worth that ? Should seventy million people die so that seventy million can lead an upper-class life ? When I think of El Salvador, when I remember that conversation with the theologians, I cannot sleep. The Gospel is being attacked. Jesus is being crucified again in the name of economic policy. Would that we could say with Jesus : God forgive them, for they don't know what they are doing. But I am afraid sometimes they do know exactly what they are doing. They are eliminating the poor so that others may have more material goods.

Pope Paul VI many times asked the world to reflect on the forces of death. He said they are the desire *to have more* than others; to *know more* than others and *to be more powerful* than others. These desires become incarnate in groups that dedicate themselves to the system : the technocrats, the transnationals, the banks, the big industrialists

and the military. These groups make the decisions over the right to life of the majority of the people in the world.

Paul VI begged us to evangelize the system of decision-making. We, the people, must struggle with the technocrats, the transnationals, the banks, the big industrialists and the military, and take from them the right to decide who shall live and who shall die. Life is God's very being and no military force can take this from God, even if it does call its atomic submarine *Corpus Christi*, *The Body of Christ*.

My friends, remember what Jesus says to us in the Gospel of Mark (8, 34-37): *Does a person gain anything if he wins the whole world and loses his life? Of course not: There is nothing he can give to regain his life.*

As Christians, we must work very hard to create a Theology of Life; a theology that will give us social priorities and that will be a radar for us in the midst of a world dominated by death. The radar of Life will steer our communities always in the direction of the Father's will : that all will have life and have it in abundance.

As you know, I have never lived for a long time in your country. But still, before we start to dialogue about all the things you would like to know, I would like to reflect with you a little about what the radar for Life means for North American Catholics.

First of all, we have to ask ourselves : how do we preach to the people of God about Life ? Is it clear to our good Christian people that Life is God Himself ? Is it clear to them that when life is damaged *in any form* or when it is destroyed, that this is idolatry? That we are stating publicly as a national : *God does not exist?* Have we meditated with them on chapter 22 of the book of Exodus, where God speaks to His people and says : . . . if you mistreat a foreigner, a widow or an orphan . . . I will answer them when they call out for help . . . and I will become angry . . . and I will take away your life.

Living the Word

My dear friends, the Lord is not fooling with us. He is not pretending to punish us. He is saying quite clearly that when we do not respect the lives of others we will lose our Life. We cannot blame God's people for not knowing this

if we did not preach it to them. As St. Paul says : how can they have faith if they have not heard the Word preached to them ?

Remember too, the words of the prophet Zephaniah (1, 12) when the Lord says to us : *I will take a lamp and search the city. I will punish the people who are self satisfied and confident, who say to themselves : The Lord never does anything, one way or the other.* The Lord has spoken and He will not repent. If this city does not become a witness to the defence and the nourishing of Life, it will be destroyed.

Every people on the face of the earth has the goodness of God given to them to contribute to the well-being of the rest of the world. In the case of the people of the United States, I would like to ask you to develop three aspects of the goodness God has given to you to be shared with all.

First of all, you are a people *sensitive* to the sufferings of others. You are also a *generous* people, willing to give of your goods and of your time. And you are a *dedicated* people, giving even your lives to that which you believe in. I ask only one thing of you. Use these aspects of your goodness only after having used your radar of life. Before you give of yourselves, before you dedicate yourselves to a cause, be sure it is in the service of life.

Remember that the world and its systems are based on *lies*. Many will lie to you and try to make you use your sensitivity and your dedication to build up the system of this world. But the truth of the Gospel is stronger than the lies of the system. Jesus is the truth and He is our radar. He alone will always lead us to make the right decisions and to see with clear eyes.

My friends, Christians in North and South America must unite now : unite in the love they have for Christ, *the Life of the world*.

Book Reviews

SHORTS

Noticeably, in the Catholic Church today, we are seeing the beginnings of a swing-back to centre. The swing is discernible in several fields, not least that of Catholic publishing. One form it has taken here is that of the republication of titles that appeared a good many years ago and that could be classified, without exaggeration, as spiritual classics. I have two to hand at the moment, both published at £3 by the Augustine Publishing Co., Chulmleigh EX18 7HL, Devon, U.K. Both deserve honourable mention at the very least; if there were space, a great deal more. The first is the late Alice Curtayne's, *Saint Catherine of Siena*, first published in 1959 by Sheed and Ward in its great days and destined to go through eight impressions before February, 1938 was out. I remember reading it with satisfaction and genuine delight way back in the thirties, for it was beautifully written by a most talented authoress. Alice Curtayne brought Saint Catherine to life for me—a mystic, if ever there was one who—I was going to say *despite* her mysticism, but I should say *because* of it—was ceaseless in her activity on behalf of the Church and whose crowning glory it was to persuade Pope Gregory XI to bring back the Papacy to Rome. There was no fear about this wonderful woman, none at all. Her life was totally mortified; her abiding joy in God complete; her splendid activity on behalf of the Church that of one who drew her strength from God alone. She shines out in her century like a star. Her example is for all time. Her lesson for all of us is total and complete. In God alone is our strength. Without Him we can do nothing. How much we need to learn it today.

I have never been able to understand the post-conciliar downgrading of the Feast of St. Joseph the Worker, first instituted at the close of the Pontificate of Pius XII. I would have thought that the *exact* opposite was required by the times in which we live. The liturgical "experts", who wrought such havoc in the wake of Vatican II, decided

otherwise. Devotion to Saint Joseph was muted as part of a general policy, which relegated the Mother of God to the background, along with His Foster Father. Perhaps in the interests of the "new ecumenism"; later, maybe, as the Divinity of Christ Himself was questioned increasingly and inanely by the new theological establishment. Strike at the Son and you strike at His Father and Mother as well. Now, thanks to Pope John Paul, the Mother of God is being restored to her rightful place in the Church and it is only natural that her Spouse should follow suit. *The Life and Glories of Saint Joseph* is one of several recently published works that stand in witness to this happy and most necessary trend. Edited by Edward Healy Thompson and first published by Burns and Oates in 1888, the Augustine Publishing Company has done well to republish it nearly a century later. This is a fine effort in the right direction. It deserves all the support that readers can give it.

The same applies to two other books which are not republications. The first entitled, *The Path to Glory* by Father David de Burgh, a Salesian priest well known for his sermons and conferences, who died in San Francisco on May 23rd last year, was published in 1980 by the Benziger Sisters Publishers, 466 East Maraposa St., Altadena, California 91001, U.S.A. At \$5.50, this penetratingly spiritual book of 199 pages is extraordinarily good value. It is made up of a whole series of short, very effective chapters, which go to the spiritual heart of every conceivable side of life. I would recommend it most warmly.

Finally, from Father John Edwards, S.J., and published by the Catholic Truth Society, 38-40 Eccleston Square, London SW1V 1PD, a just-published and wonderfully helpful and most carefully selected series of Gospel excerpts, entitled, *The Gospels for Prayer* and built round, in illustration of and by way of commentary on subject after subject that is part and parcel of the Catholic's spiritual life. Here, in other words, is the mind of Christ, straight from the Gospels—on peace and courage and calm; on chastity and obedience and so many other topics of immense and very personal relevance today. This book is a real godsend, not only for preacher and retreat-giver, but for the lay man and woman in the pew—of every age and

pressurized so hard nowadays by an increasingly pagan surround. To know what Christ thought on so many vital and ever-topical subjects, he or she need do no more than flip a page or two over and it is there, laid out before him; in Christ's own words and straight from the Gospels themselves. The price of the book is £4.50 for 201 pages. The Catholic Truth Society could have done far better than this, I think. Nevertheless, despite the high price, I hope so much that readers will make a point of buying this wonderful book and adopting the habit of brooding over its contents; just a little at a time, each day. This way they will come to do, quite easily, what we all need to do so much these days. You know what I mean — *pray*.

Paul Crane, S.J.

RECOMMENDED

As we go to press, we would like to recommend very warmly to readers of *Christian Order* three pamphlets by Father Francis Fenn, S.J., all published by the Catholic Truth Society, 38/40 Eccleston Square, London SW1V 1PD, U.K.

They are:

Christ Will Come Again (DO 530 : 35p)

Praying For The Dead (D527 : 30p)

Sunday (DO 529 : 30p)

ST. DUTHAC'S BOOK SERVICE

— A SELECTION —

The Representatives by Mgr. Mario Oliveri. Price £8.50. (\$17.00)

Pope John Paul II looks to his "Representatives" to encourage the teaching of the Magisterium in full integrity at a time when the current trend seems to be towards a pluriform Church.

The Pope, the Council & the Mass by J. Likoudis and K. D. Whitehead. Price £8.50. (\$17.00)

Happiness & Christian Hope by Dr. W. A. Marra. Price £4.90. (\$10.00)

The Historical Credibility of Hans Kung by J. F. Costanzo, S.J. Price £7.90. (\$16.00)

My Words Will Not Pass Away — Doctrinal writings of St. Pius X. Price £3.00. (\$6.00)

Pope Paul's New Mass (3rd book of the trilogy by Michael Davies). Price £6.00. (\$12.00)

Eucharistic Sacrifice & the Reformation by Francis Clark, S.J. Price £7.50. (\$15.00)

The Meaning of Prayer by Louis Collin, C.SS.R. Price £3.50. (\$7.00)

Edmund Campion by Evelyn Waugh. Price £2.80. (\$5.70)

Pope John Paul II — Selected excerpts from his addresses. Nos. 1-6. Price 20p each. (\$00.40 each)

(All prices include for postage)

Write for full Book List to:

ST. DUTHAC'S BOOK SERVICE

**39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon,
G.B. CR2 6BG.**

DATE FOR YOUR DIARY

There is a date early in this coming year which we think you will agree, when you know more about it, you have to keep.

The date is FEBRUARY 20th, 1982

The time 11 a.m. — 4.30 p.m.

The place, THE PORCHESTER HALL in
QUEENSWAY

The occasion, a public meeting in preparation for the visit of the Holy Father in the Spring.

The object, to give voice to the voiceless.

“We are the people of England
We have not spoken yet”.

We are going to speak on February 20th of this coming year—with no uncertain voice.

Further information on this page next month.

This will give you the whole picture. We know you will pledge your support and make what will be a date for your diary

A DAY TO REMEMBER